LB
2301
A8

APR 1 1929

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES BULLETIN

VOLUME XV NUMBER 1

The College Teacher

The Addresses and Proceedings
of the
Fifteenth Annual Meeting

March, 1929

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

BULLETIN

VOLUME XV MARCH, 1929 NUMBER 1

The College Teacher

The Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting

Edited by

ROBERT L. KELLY

Executive Secretary of the Association

Published by

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

Lime & Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, $3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1929–30

PRESIDENT:

President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College.

VICE-PRESIDENT:

President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City.

TREASURER:

Warden Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College, Columbia University.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Trevor Arnett, President, General Education Board.
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College.

FORMER PRESIDENTS

1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted.*

1915–16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College.

1916–17 President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College.

1917–18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College.
President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding.*

1918–19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

1919–20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University.

1920–21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College.

1921–22 President Clark W. Chamberlain,* Denison University.

1922–23 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College.
President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding.*

1923–24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

1924–25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University.

1925–26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College.

1926–27 Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan.

1927–28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College.

1928–29 Mr. Trevor Arnett, General Education Board.

* Deceased.

General

REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:

President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College (one year).
President A. A. Brown, University of Chattanooga (two years).
Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo (three years).

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:

Professor Arthur H. Compton, The University of Chicago (1929–31).

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS:

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman.*
President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation.
President J. H. T. Main, Grinnell College.
President W. P. Few, Duke University.
Mr. J. Frederick Larson, Dartmouth College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ATHLETICS:

Professor Bert E. Young, Indiana University, *Chairman.*
Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
Dean Joseph Reiner, Loyola University.
President J. W. Provine, Mississippi College.
President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

COMMISSION ON THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION:

Controller, C. C. Wintringer, Princeton University, *Chairman.*
Auditor N. C. Plimpton, The University of Chicago.
Controller Robert B. Stewart, Purdue University.
Professor Floyd W. Reeves, University of Kentucky.
President Walter F. Dexter, Whittier College.

COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS:

President F. L. McVey, University of Kentucky, *Chairman.*
Director Charles R. Mann, American Council on Education.
Professor C. H. Judd, University of Chicago.

COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS:

President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College, *Chairman.*
Dean Otis E. Randall, Brown University.*
President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University.
President Albert Britt, Knox College.
Dean Marshall S. Brown, New York University.
Dean Charles L. Raper, Syracuse University.

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP:

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College, *Chairman.*
Dean C. S. Boucher, The University of Chicago.
Dean C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College.
Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo.
President C. D. Gray, Bates College.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM:

President C. C. Little, University of Michigan,* *Chairman.*
President Arthur E. Morgan, Antioch College.
President N. F. Coleman, Reed College.
President Ada L. Comstock, Radcliffe College.
Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University.

COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS:

Mr. Trevor Arnett, General Education Board, *Chairman.*
Treasurer Raymond N. Ball, University of Rochester.
Vice-President Lloyd Steere, The University of Chicago.
Treasurer F. L. Jackson, Davidson College.
Dr. A. W. Anthony, Trustee, Bates College.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS:

The President, *ex officio.*
The Executive Secretary, *ex officio.*
The Treasurer, *ex officio.*

* Resigned.

THE BULLETIN IN 1929

In accordance with the action of the Association at Chattanooga, January 12, this issue of the BULLETIN is a combination of the usual February, March and April numbers. The complete proceedings of the fifteenth annual meeting are presented here in one book.

All subscribers are requested to take notice that Volume XV (1929) will contain four issues only instead of six—appearing in March, May, November and December.

The regular price of an annual subscription to the BULLETIN is $3.00; single copies 75 cents; the March issue combining the February, March and April issues is $2.00.

Members of the Association have the privilege of a special club rate for faculty and board members of 50 cents per annum, or a single subscription for two years, $1.00. The price to them for single copies is 25 cents; for the March issue containing the proceedings, 75 cents.

While some contributed papers and addresses will be published during the year, the future issues will feature particularly educational studies in the field of the standing commissions, official announcements, and fresh material gathered, analyzed and made available to members of the Association by the Association staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial, Robert L. Kelly	7
Teachers' Salaries—The Presidential Address, *Trevor Arnett*	9
The Undergraduate College and Higher Education in the United States, Canada and Great Britain, *Vincent Massey*	20
In Praise of Ignorance, *William Louis Poteat*	31
Report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, *Ernest H. Wilkins*	40
The Graduate School and College Teaching, *W. P. Few*	46
Great Teachers—and Methods of Developing Them, *Robert L. Kelly*	49
Who is a Great Teacher? *Guy E. Snavely*	68
The Improvement of College Teaching as an Administrational Problem, *Rees E. Tulloss*	73
The Production of Good College Teaching, *Charles H. Judd*	90
Experimenting with the College Teacher's Problems, *Melvin E. Haggerty*	99
Report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, *W. W. Boyd*	111
Report of the Commission on Educational Surveys, *Charles R. Mann*	115
Report of the Commission on College Personnel Technique, *Herbert E. Hawkes*	123
Report of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in the Fine Arts, *Frederick C. Ferry*	127
Cooperation between Schools and Colleges in Raising Intellectual Standards—Report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship, *Raymond Walters*	130
Report of the Commission on the College Curriculum. *Clarence C. Little*	151
Report of the Commission on College Athletics, *Bert E. Young*	153
Report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, *Raymond N. Ball*	162
Report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary for 1928–29, *Robert L. Kelly*	167
Report of the Treasurer for the Year 1928, *Bernard I. Bell*	175
Report of the Auditing Committee, *Charles H. Rammelkamp*	180
The Minutes of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges, *Robert L. Kelly*	181
Constitution of the Association of American Colleges	194
List of Members, 1929	196
Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee, March 8, 1929	208
Appendix	214

EDITORIAL

ROBERT L. KELLY

Dr. David Snedden, of Teachers College, Columbia University, in a statement which he presented to the National Industrial Conference Board at its meeting in New York on February 28, 1929, declared:

> There are some persons—very few among the lay men as yet—who have become convinced that certain fairly revolutionary procedures are very desirable and are now somewhat practicable in schools. At present, movements to this end are largely confined to schools for children under twelve and to liberal colleges.

This declaration from an educational authority not himself directly identified with this phase of American education is a striking confirmation of the conviction of an increasing number of people that the liberal college is to-day the most active and alert unit of American education.

About fifteen years ago the liberal colleges of this country dedicated themselves to a thoroughgoing overhauling of their entire technique of procedure, both in the field of administration and teaching. In order that they might carry on this work cooperatively they organized the Association of American Colleges. The proceedings of the fifteen annual meetings together with the work of the standing commissions and the researches made in the office headquarters constitute an invaluable literature in this field.

The general theme of the Chattanooga meeting, the proceedings of which are reported in this issue of the BULLETIN was "The College Teacher." All the addresses and the procedure centered about this central idea in so far as that was possible. Not only the Association itself but numerous affiliated organizations—the Council of Church Board of Education and several of the denominational college presidents' associations—adopted the same central theme.

In view of this fact, the papers of Robert L. Kelly, Guy E. Snavely, Rees E. Tulloss and Charles H. Judd, although delivered before a mass meeting on Thursday morning, and not, therefore, strictly under the auspices of the Association alone, are included in this issue.

In the May issue of the BULLETIN other papers will be included not strictly a part of the proceedings of the Association but bearing directly upon the general theme. These papers will consider the sub-topics, "The Uses and Abuses of Standardization" and "More Vital Methods of College Teaching."

The entire proceedings of the fifteenth annual meeting are printed in this issue of the BULLETIN at the request of the Association itself. The March issue thus takes the place of what have been recently the February, March and April issues.

INTRODUCING MR. ARCHIE M. PALMER

At the meeting of the Executive Committee held in the office of the Executive Secretary in New York City on Friday, March 8, 1929, Mr. Archie M. Palmer, Assistant Director of the Institute of International Education, was elected Associate Secretary of the Association. Mr. Palmer will enter upon his work on August 1, 1929, and will be concerned more particularly with the "Research Department" the need for which was set forth by the Executive Secretary in his annual report in Chattanooga.

Mr. Palmer received his A.B. degree from Cornell University and served for three years as the Secretary of the College of Arts and Sciences of that institution. He served three years, 1917–20, in the regular army in France and Germany during the World War, first as 2nd Lieutenant and later as 1st Lieutenant. He served one year in the sales research of the Proctor and Gamble Company and two years as Alumni Secretary of Columbia University. During the last two years he has been Assistant Director of the Institute of International Education. He has his M.A. degree from Columbia and will complete his residence requirements for the Ph.D. degree in the Department of College Administration and Teaching in that University in June, 1929.

Mr. Palmer is already well known to many members of this Association and he possesses rare equipment for the task upon which he is entering.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

MR. TREVOR ARNETT

President of the Association of American Colleges, 1928–29

At the meeting of this Association held at Atlantic City last January, there was so much discussion regarding the college teacher, what training and qualifications he should have, how he should be selected and other kindred topics, that it seemed advisable to select as the central theme for this meeting, "The College Teacher," and present to you carefully prepared papers on that subject. Since the financial reward of the college teacher is an important factor in his welfare and success, I have concluded that I can not do better than devote my address to a summary of the present financial situation of the college teacher, as disclosed by a survey recently published by the General Education Board, and offer a few suggestions for your consideration.

The inquiry to which I refer covers the seven-year period from 1919–20 to 1926–27 and is a continuation of a previous inquiry on the same subject for the five-year period 1914–15 to 1919–20. It appears from the recent survey that the special effort which was undertaken very generally in 1920 by the higher institutions of learning to increase the salaries of teachers to offset the lamentable condition in which the teachers were then placed through the increase in the cost of living has been successful in that respect, but has scarcely done more than offset it. The data secured from the financial officers of 302 colleges of arts, literature, and science and corresponding colleges or departments of universities show that in the period 1919–20 to 1926–27 the average salary paid to teachers, of the rank of instructor and upwards, increased 29.8 per cent—from $2,279 to $2,958.

The average salary paid in 1926–27 ranged for the several geographical divisions of the country from $3,385 for New England, an increase of 29.9 per cent over 1919–20 to $2,660 for the Southern States, an increase of 33.4 per cent. This latter per cent of increase was the largest for any geographical division, and it is interesting to note that it occurred in the South, where the average salary in 1926–27 was the lowest. For men's and coeducational institutions, the average salary in 1926–27 was $3,003, and for the women's colleges $2,656. However, the per cent of increase in women's colleges since 1919–20 was 43 as compared to 28 in men's and coeducational institutions.

In making comparisons of salaries paid at different periods, one can not determine whether an increase is real until one learns how the cost of living and the purchasing power of the dollar compare at those dates. Fortunately, we have, for the period under review, reliable data on these subjects prepared by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics and by the National Industrial Conference Board of New York City. From their reports we find that the cost of living decreased nearly 19 per cent between 1920 and 1927, and that on the basis of par for the dollar in 1914 its purchasing power increased from about 49 cents in 1920 to about 62 cents in 1927. The average increase in teachers' salaries previously referred to, viz., 29.8 per cent during this period, was therefore a real increase, in that, coincidently, the value of the dollar increased and the cost of living decreased. The economic status in 1927 was thus clearly an improved one. But what can be said of it in comparison with the economic condition of college teachers in 1914, at the opening of the World War, which was the basic date of the previous study of teachers' salaries?

The survey reveals the following relation between the nominal average salaries and the real average salaries based on their ability to satisfy the teachers' needs. Taking 1914–15 as the basic year, the nominal average salary and the real average salary were $1,724. By 1919–20 the

average nominal salary had risen to $2,279, but its purchasing power in comparison with that of 1914–15 was but $1,114. In 1926–27 the average nominal salary was $2,958, and the real average salary $1,825 on the basis of the 1914–15 dollar. Thus we see that despite the efforts exerted within those years to improve the teachers' financial condition in these institutions, they were but slightly better off in 1927 than were like workers in 1914. But the emergency existing in 1920 has been met, and the salaries of teachers, in these higher educational institutions, are, it seems, at least on a pre-war basis.

Additional Earnings of Teachers

An impression widely prevails that teachers in colleges and universities, especially in those situated in urban communities, supplement their regular salaries to a considerable degree by additional earnings. To ascertain whether this impression was based on fact, the General Education Board asked for information on this point from the teachers themselves. From the several colleges of arts, literature and science and the corresponding departments in universities 11,361 teachers replied. Of this number 7,557 —66.5 per cent—reported that they supplemented their regular salaries for the nine months' session by other earnings. Several things became manifest from a study of these replies. A larger proportion of teachers in the higher ranks supplemented their incomes than in the lower ranks. 76.2 per cent of professors, 70.1 per cent of associate professors, 61.7 per cent of assistant professors and 52.4 per cent of instructors added to their earnings by outside work. In institutions located in cities having a population of 100,000 or over, relatively more engaged in extra work than in institutions situated in rural districts. Teachers in men's and coeducational institutions supplemented their salaries in larger proportion than teachers in women's colleges—more than two-thirds of those replying from the former, and less than half of those replying from the latter

added to their regular earnings. Family responsibility appears to be a compelling factor. Of the 7,376 married teachers, 77.2 per cent supplemented their regular earnings, while but 46.7 per cent of the 3,927 single teachers did so.

The teachers were asked to state whether they did extra work from necessity or from choice: 71.9 per cent reported they did it from necessity and 28.1 per cent from choice. Of the 6,550 expressing preference, 77.2 per cent preferred to do regular work only.

Of the 11,361 teachers answering the questionnaire nearly one-fifth replied that they had private, unearned income of an appreciable amount. Apparently appreciable private income had little effect on whether its possessor did additional work.

The nature of the extra work which teachers do is interesting. Of the 7,072 teachers giving complete information both as to regular salary, and as to amount and character of supplementary earnings, 69.7 per cent do extra teaching or other service either in their own or other institutions and in this way earn practically one-half of the supplementary earnings. Many of these same teachers do other kinds of additional work as well as extra teaching. Writing is the next most popular field, in which 25.3 per cent engage; 19.5 per cent lecture; 10 per cent act as consultants, and 25.2 per cent render miscellaneous services. Teachers in urban institutions apparently find greater opportunity for extra teaching, writing, and consultation than teachers in rural institutions, but for lecturing and miscellaneous services, the comparison is slightly in favor of teachers in rural institutions.

An important fact which was ascertained was the monetary value of the extra work. The 7,072 teachers who reported doing additional work earned an amount equal to 23.8 per cent of their regular annual salaries. The earnings range from a few dollars per year to $10,000 or more. The median is $522. Only a fourth make $1,000 or more, and but 7.7 per cent as much as $2,000 or more. A very

few succeed in earning considerable sums. Seventy-seven of the 7,072 earn $5,000 and upwards, and thirteen earn $10,000 or over. In the survey you will find data covering the range of salaries paid in the several geographical divisions of the country arranged by ranks from instructor upwards, and classified according to size of institution.

I have given very briefly the principal features of the survey, because the facts disclosed regarding salaries paid and the extent and variety of extra work done by the Faculties of Arts, Literature and Science suggest questions which are worthy of consideration. I shall not attempt to answer them, nor to explain the causes which led to the present conditions; neither shall I advance arguments in detail for or against the changes in procedure which the questions might suggest. I shall simply raise them for your consideration.

Flexible Maximum for Salary Scale

The first question relates to the salary scale. Its range is very narrow. No one receives a salary over $15,000, and but 1 per cent of the teachers receive more than $7,000 per year. The situation is somewhat like that of the Church of Laodicea—neither very hot nor very cold. It is probably true that among college and university teachers a larger proportion obtains a reasonable remuneration than is the case in business, law and other professions, but in those fields there is no limit to the financial reward the man of ability may secure. Does the prevailing low maximum salary work to the detriment of the profession of college and university teaching? Is there danger that the exceptional man will be enticed away from it, and promising youths deterred from entering it? It is true that college life possesses attractions which constitute part of the reward and there is also the satisfaction of rendering altruistic service, but nevertheless would not the prestige of the profession be enhanced and its personnel improved if its members could look forward with assurance to a finan-

cial reward somewhat commensurate with that to which their talents would have entitled them if they had entered other fields. It requires courage and devotion to duty for a college teacher, whose salary is scarcely adequate to provide the necessities of life for himself and family, to refuse an offer to engage in some other pursuit at double or treble salary. Yet there are many such instances. Is not the training of youth and the advancement of knowledge fully as important for the nation and as worthy of adequate financial reward as ministering to its material needs? Our attitude toward our teachers and scientists is fundamentally wrong. We know they are indispensable and must spend many years in preparing for their profession, and yet we ask them to be content with small salaries.

The first question I ask then is this. Should the salary scale be widened, not by lowering the minimum but by making the maximum flexible to permit salaries to distinguished scholars and teachers, as attractive, all things being considered, as they would receive in other callings? If there were a few large salaries to which the ambitious might aspire they would act as a stimulant to the whole profession, and would enhance its prestige and tend to raise the salary level. They would make it possible to recognize individual differences, whereas a uniform salary scale tends to adjust itself to the least able members of the group and in general makes for a low salary scale. I am also in favor of paying larger salaries to the younger faculty members to bring them above the minimum as rapidly as possible, to enable them to care for the needs of their families. Many of the teachers stated that their most difficult time financially was during the early years of teaching, when their salaries were small and the family expenses were heavy. Temptations to leave the profession at this period are very strong.

There are two difficulties to be met in carrying out this suggestion, one of which is financial and the other social. I am glad to say that some progress is being made in over-

coming the financial difficulty. Certain of the leading universities and colleges, both large and small, have secured funds for salary increases and are paying to their leading professors salaries of $7,000 to $10,000 per year. One university has received several endowments of $200,000 each and is seeking more, for Distinguished Service Professorships to provide salaries of $10,000. These examples will doubtless be multiplied, for nothing succeeds like success. Good salaries attract able men. Able men make institutions renowned. Men of means are inspired to contribute to renowned institutions, and then the circle is complete.

The other difficulty, which I have called social, is likely to be caused by the faculties themselves because of their unwillingness to have salaries paid to exceptional persons which do not conform to the salary scale. This attitude makes it difficult for the administration to recognize marked ability among the faculty or to invite distinguished scholars from outside. I feel confident this recognition would be an advantage to the profession as a whole and would benefit the particular faculty concerned.

Control of Extra Work of Teachers

The second question relates to extra earnings of faculty members. I am led to raise it after discovering the attitude of the majority of the teachers on the subject, as expressed in the questionnaire. You will recall that of those engaging in outside work 71.9 per cent replied that they did it from necessity, and 77.2 per cent indicated that they preferred to do regular work only. It would, therefore, seem to be a correct inference that if the regular salary were adequate the teacher would rather devote himself solely to regular work and to those activities and contacts which increased his knowledge and experience and benefited his institution. I have also learned from conversations with college and university administrators of their

desire to work out some satisfactory plan for regulating or controlling outside work of their faculties so that justice may be done to the teachers and institutions alike. Additional earnings are made possible on account of the few hours per week in which teachers are required to meet their classes. This condition is the result of custom and is based on the familiar theory that teachers need time for study, research and relaxation in order to keep abreast of their subjects. But, whatever the reasons for the condition and the soundness of the theory, the college teacher has opportunity to engage in outside work which is found in hardly any other field of activity. Where the opportunity is thus furnished and the need for additional income is acute, it is not surprising that about two-thirds of college and university teachers engage in work in addition to their regular appointment. In many cases the teachers have been encouraged by the college administration to eke out their salaries in this manner. But is the effort worth the candle, both from the college point of view and that of the teacher; and is not the motive, that of making money, likely to work to the disadvantage of the college by creating a divided interest and to the injury of the teacher by over-taxing and dissipating his strength?

From the survey we discovered that two-thirds of the teachers did extra work and added 23.8 per cent to their regular salaries. These extra earnings would equal about 15 per cent of the total faculty salaries. Would not the situation be greatly improved if the institution should add 15 per cent to its pay roll to meet the needs of those doing extra work and thus be in a position to control and regulate it? It then could encourage those outside activities which were beneficial both to the teacher in enlarging his vision and to the institution in enlarging its contacts and service, and it could discourage participation in those which were solely pot-boilers.

Many of the extra activities in which teachers engage are desirable both for the college and for the teacher, and I do

not advocate their elimination, but I suggest that wherever possible, they be made part of the regular work and arranged for on their merits, as is the case with the other work of the institution. In other words, I am suggesting that in Colleges of Arts, Literature and Science the so-called full time principle be the objective sought.

If the plan which I have suggested were followed, I imagine much of the extra work would be eliminated, especially much of the extra teaching, which as you will recall, constituted one-half of all extra work. Whenever it was undertaken, either in the teacher's own college or elsewhere, it would be because it was thought advisable both for the college and for the teacher. If services were rendered to another institution, the teacher's work in his own institution might be reduced accordingly, and his total reward equitably determined. Administrative knowledge and control of outside work of teachers, so far as possible, would tend to remedy inequalities and injustices in salaries paid. I shall not prescribe the methods to be used in controlling outside work; I am simply raising the question for your consideration. However, since need of a larger income seems to be the present cause, if the college should meet this need it might properly ask the teacher to give up outside work except in cases mutually agreed upon.

Modification of Permanent Tenure

My final observation relates to the so-called permanent tenure. Permanent tenure applies as a rule only to the ranks of professor and associate professor and is the outgrowth of several factors and conditions, the chief of which are:

(1) The difficulty of changing to another calling in middle or later life.
(2) The fact that a change to another educational institution usually involves removal to another community.
(3) The small salary paid imposes some compensating obligation on the institution, and in addition some expectation as to a retiring allowance.

(4) The desire to assure the teacher freedom of speech and free expression of truth as he sees it, and to protect him from being the victim of unreasoning prejudice on the part of trustees, students and public.

These are important considerations and I do not wish to minimize them, nor do I think that the teacher should be deprived of any of the safeguards which the peculiar conditions of his calling demand, but I am wondering whether the custom, in its one-sided application has not had its disadvantages and whether it has not operated to keep professors' salaries at low levels more than any other factor. It puts professors in a class where many of the rules which prevail in other professions and walks of life do not apply. If a bank or a commercial corporation desires to appoint an officer, it seeks the best and offers him a salary sufficiently large to attract him, but invariably with the understanding that if experience shows that it has overrated his ability, or for any reason he fails to measure up to the task, it is free to displace him. I have known instances where university trustees were willing to pay a large salary to secure a distinguished scholar, if the principle of permanent tenure had not prevailed. Has not this custom making possible a permanent refuge to some persons of mediocre ability who are unwilling to subject themselves to the tests of fitness which prevail in other walks of life diminished the prestige of the profession of college and university teaching? Should not teachers in the higher institutions of learning receive a financial reward, all things being considered, as attractive as that which is given in other fields; and are they not more likely to obtain it if they are willing to make some concessions regarding permanent tenure? I leave this suggestion with you for your earnest consideration.

In conclusion may I repeat the three questions:

(1) Whether the salary range for college teachers should not be widened by making the upper

limit flexible so as to provide salaries large enough to attract able men.

(2) Whether it would not be well for colleges and universities to add a sufficient sum to the regular salaries of the faculties to enable them to control outside work, so far as might be wise, and to include it in the regular work of the staff.

(3) Whether waiving the principle of permanent tenure in return for higher salaries would not be an advantage to the teaching profession.

FROM READERS OF THE BULLETIN

It wasn't until last night that I had a chance to read your November BULLETIN. It is a fine job and speaks well for the Association.—*Frederick P. Keppel, President, The Carnegie Corporation.*

We are finding the Association of American Colleges BULLETIN very valuable.—*Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University.*

I am very enthusiastic over the subjects that I see treated in the BULLETIN, as I have been trying for a long time to find some publication which would help me in my administrative work.—*H. Gary Hudson, Dean, Blackburn College.*

I am perfectly delighted with what the Association is doing. There are all kinds of problems that we are now trying to solve, and if you have any advice to offer which will help in their solution, it will be appreciated by our Board of Governors and by me personally.—*Enoch B. Garey, President, St. John's College.*

THE UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN

THE HON. VINCENT MASSEY

Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States from the Dominion of Canada

I feel very rash tonight venturing to address this learned audience. All the sins of omission and commission—chiefly omission—of my undergraduate days seem to rise up before me as I face you. I confess that you see me in a reminiscent and humble mood. But notwithstanding certain twinges of remorse, I am happy to be with you here this evening for more than one reason. In the first place, my roots are firmly struck in academic soil and although they have not been as well watered of late years as they should have been, they—to complete my horticultural metaphor—rejoice in the warm congenial collegiate atmosphere of an occasion such as this.

Again, gentlemen, I am glad to be here because the realities of international affairs are nowhere better understood than in the realm of education. In the world of the mind there can be no disharmony between communities. The educational systems of neighboring countries may differ widely, but it is the habit of educationists to regard themselves less as rivals than as allies in a common cause. What competition there may be between them is wholesome, for it is not in the realm of things material, but rather of ideas and ideals. In the sphere of the mind the asperities of life are softened.

So it is with things of the heart. We are drawn together by whatever touches us most deeply. We have had recently a fine instance of this. No British subject in the last few weeks could fail to be touched by the vivid interest and

genuine feeling which have been shown everywhere in your great country over the grave illness of our Sovereign. As one of His Majesty's representatives in the United States, I should like to say how deeply this attitude of friendly sympathy has been appreciated by the King's subjects in Canada who so fervently hope and pray for His Majesty's full restoration to health. The great qualities of our King, his unflagging devotion to duty, his fine sense of a Sovereign's responsibility—have so endeared him to his people that we say, with renewed fervor, "God Save the King."

I am happy to be with you, gentlemen, because this is a meeting of the representatives of colleges in the true sense of the ancient word, and I am a sincere believer in the old-fashioned college. I am happy to realize that in so many places in your country it has maintained inviolate its old traditions of simplicity and thoroughness and idealism. In many cases in the modern world in which we live, the college through the generations has become surrounded with a vast fabric of professional and technical institutions, but whether it be isolated or part of a larger system, I believe it is not too much to say that the college, rightly conceived, is the dynamic of higher education.

The college has a peculiar significance to the people of what, for lack of a better name, we call the "English-speaking world." It is really part of the common heritage which we cherish. I may be wrong, but I believe that your colleges of liberal arts and the collegiate foundations of the old universities of England and the corresponding institutions in the British dominions possess certain common characteristics which are shared in full measure, at least, by no institutions elsewhere. What are these characteristics? There are probably three important ones. Our colleges are for the most part residential communities; secondly, they exist to teach the humanities and are essentially non-professional, and thirdly, they endeavor to train the character as well as to educate the mind. This trinity of objects is of course common to secondary schools the world

over, but in the realm of higher education I believe these are the peculiar possessions of the American and British systems.

The geneological tree of the college possesses its interest. I suppose we must regard as the original ancestor the group of poor scholars whom Walter de Merton formed into a permanent society at Oxford in 1264 when he commenced to devise statutes for their government. My own college, Balliol, narrowly missed that honor by the excessive frugality of its founder. The picturesque story you probably know. John Balliol, the thirteenth century magnate, in his baronial operations had been none too delicate in his relations with certain churches in the diocese of Durham. The worthy bishop, justly incensed, ordered him, for the good of his soul, to make provision for the education of students at Oxford. John apparently set a modest valuation on his soul because his endowment was meager—legend has it that it was the nominal sum of twopence (I refrain from enlarging upon the fact that Balliol was a Scottish name). However, for the honor of the family and for the glory of education, as we Balliol men modestly put it, John's wife, the Lady Dervorguilla, put the foundation on a permanent basis about twenty years later. Feminists have never made the most of the incident.

The English colleges encountered many vicissitudes through the centuries. Apart from the penury of the early generations, they had to cope in turn with the hostility of the monasteries, the menace of civil war, and, not least, the lethargy of the eighteenth century. How the torch was carried across the Atlantic is a matter of commonplace knowledge. Education in this country and in Canada owes much to the tiny flame which was kept alive by devoted men who had been nourished in the ancient collegiate traditions. As a result of this effort, all over this continent there are scattered institutions, new and old, rich and poor, whose simple aim and actual achievement has been to fulfill the aspirations of the founder of one of your oldest houses of

learning which was created "that youth might be fitted for public employment both in church and state." The educational life of this country offers a fascinating study to the observer. As a visitor, I am subject to a constant thrill in learning at first hand something of your university systems; their schools for advanced specialized study; their institutes of research; their courses of preparation for every profession which man can follow; the perfection of their organization; their capacity to give the multitude contact with knowledge. But in all this bewildering pattern there is no finer strand than that golden thread which represents the simple effort to produce the good citizen. Such is the essential function of the college and this I believe must be the key to higher education everywhere.

It was suggested to me that I should say something this evening about the colleges of my own country, their traditions, their problems and future development. You, gentlemen, however, are not unfamiliar with higher education in Canada. The natural interchange of teachers and students as well, between our two countries, makes possible a mutual knowledge of methods and ideals on both sides of the line. Everywhere I go I find Canadians in the faculties of your universities. We are sorry to lose them but we are happy to feel, if they have left us, that they are playing some part in your great achievements. Many graduates of your universities are of course to be found in our faculties. In the student world, too, there is a reciprocal migration. Numbers of Canadians are taking advantage of certain courses offered by your universities. There is also a considerable movement to the north. I find that in one of our universities alone, and it is not the largest, nearly three hundred students from this country are at present pursuing their studies.

The score of universities and colleges in Canada which have the full right to grant degrees—we may perhaps thank the poverty of early years for the fact that we have not been led to dissipate our energies in a greater number—

these institutions reflect varied traditions. The oldest are French. In Quebec two great universities and a group of secondary schools known as "Classical Colleges" maintain the best traditions of the ecclesiastical system of old France. There is much to be learned from these institutions. The torch of the classics is held high in their halls and—perhaps partly because of this fact—under no system is the use of one's own language as a spoken and written tongue more effectively taught.

In our English-speaking universities and colleges, the main influence, appropriately enough, is English and Scottish. Their personnel itself in the first half of the nineteenth century came principally from Great Britain and the models for the new foundations were British. The curricula and many of the forms of our academic life reveal English origin. On the other hand, we must thank the Scot for much. For one thing, as the personification of self-reliance, it is probably due to him that it is the custom of our universities to leave the student to work out his own academic destiny without too much assistance. The product of the college, as the wise teacher knows, can sometimes be improved by judicious neglect. We are grateful for the Scottish strain in our colleges. Your system as well as ours owes much to the fact that the Scot, along with the many things which legend has it that he keeps, holds with commendable tenacity to a tradition of academic thoroughness.

Our universities like yours, however, are open to constantly changing influences. The university is a curiously sensitive organism. Like Ulysses it can say, "I am a part of all that I have met." The university can thus give the finest and most expressive reflection of the traditions of the community which it serves. It is often the very image and transcript of the forces which make up a nation. It is so with your colleges and universities. It is so with ours. On each side of our mutual border these foundations honestly express their respective civilizations, which are funda-

mentally and perpetually friendly and yet are wholesomely different in their approach to common problems.

In the academic realm many of the questions with which we are confronted are identical. One of our mutual problems and probably the greatest is due to a virtue which all North Americans possess—an unquenchable enthusiasm for education. From this arises the vexed problem of numbers. The delicate mechanism of instruction is often threatened by the flood of those who wish to enjoy its benefits. Professional and technical training can surmount the difficulty with relative ease. The acquisition of knowledge and imparting of technique—these functions—can, of course, be organized on a scale commensurate with most demands without loss of power. But the peculiar task of the college in which human relationships are all important, in which the training of the individual mind and character is the objective—this function can be stultified by numbers. It is a truism to say that mass production is the negation of the collegiate ideal.

Some of us in Canada have been asking ourselves about the matter and method and aim of liberal education. Professional and graduate schools have, of course, clear objectives. They require no definition, but those courses which exist to impart to the student the gift of the humanities are subtler in their aim and more elusive in their substance. It often happens that we are so busy constructing curricula, and devising tests and examinations, that we often momentarily forget the purpose of the superb mechanism which we have erected. And yet we well know the objective of liberal education when we stop to think about it, and we have only to remind ourselves that its over-organization can only result in its paralysis.

As I have said, our educational problems are in a large measure like yours. We are attempting, too, to solve some of them by similar methods. There is, however, one experiment which has proved successful in Canada, of which it may interest you to hear. It is closely related to the

problem to which I have alluded—how to keep liberal education from being submerged by the flood of those who seek it.

About forty years ago, the Legislature of the Province of Ontario passed an act which provided for the association with the Provincial University of other colleges and universities which might wish to join forces with it under a scheme of "university federation." The plan, which has never been substantially changed, divides the instruction in the humanities between the university proper and an indefinite number of colleges, of which one is a "university college," a state-controlled body conducted by the university itself. Under the plan there was established a teaching faculty in the university proper in certain subjects, including those requiring laboratory equipment. The federated colleges are required to provide their own instruction in the remainder of the field. Examinations are conducted and all degrees, except those in Divinity, are conferred by the university alone.

The purpose of the plan of federation was originally to economize the financial and educational resources of competing institutions. The most difficult task of its authors was to safeguard the traditions and the corporate entity of federating institutions, and in particular to preserve their religious autonomy. The latter end was accomplished by giving constituent colleges the control of all subjects of instruction which might be religiously controversial.

A due share in the academic government of the university as a whole is guaranteed to the colleges by giving them the right to elect an appropriate number of their members to the Senate of the university, which body has supreme authority over all purely academic matters, as distinguished from those connected with finance, property and appointments. The latter are the concern of a Board of Governors. The colleges, however, retain their own administrative machinery and local independence in all matters not subject to university regulations. In short, the plan is a true federation.

Such, in very brief outline, is this system of university organization which I believe at the time of its inauguration was unique. Since the Enabling Act was passed in 1887, full advantage has been taken of its provisions. The first institution to enter federation with the University of Toronto was a Roman Catholic college possessing faculties in arts and divinity. A few years later a long established university of the Methodist Church (now merged in the United Church of Canada) became a constituent college of the University. Its example was followed a few years later by a university conducted by the Church of England and possessing old traditions. In addition to the four colleges of arts which are now grouped within the University, three divinity schools are enjoying the advantages of university federation. The plan has long since passed the experimental stage. It is regarded on all sides as a demonstrated success. Its example has been followed in many Canadian universities. There are, for instance, three Roman Catholic dioceses in Canada whose divinity schools have entered into relations with the local universities similar to those existing in Toronto.

The most striking achievement of this plan of university federation was of course to harmonize the jealously-guarded rights of denominational colleges with their membership in a state-owned university in which no religious faith can occupy a privileged position. Another important result—the economy in personnel and equipment made possible by the scheme requires no comment. But one of the greatest advantages of the federation was hardly foreseen by its authors. I refer to the fact that under the system the vast student body of what would otherwise be a great centralized university is divided into several homogeneous and manageable groups. Forty years ago there were many critics of this plan of university federation who, although they regarded the union of individual institutions with the Provincial University as undoubtedly wise, looked upon the perpetuation of these semi-independent self-governing units

in the larger community as a regrettable necessity. Today I believe there is none who would not look on this very fact as one of the great virtues of this scheme. In certain respects such a plan, it seems to me, represents one of the few cases in life where you can eat your cake and have it too. The college as we know it under the scheme I have tried to describe, gives the undergraduate the intimacy of a smaller academic community; the closer association with teacher and fellow student; the participation in a tradition local enough to be realizable and natural. On the other hand, the student is privileged to enjoy in full measure the life and facilities of a great university—its libraries, its laboratories, its festivities and sports. Not the least of the advantages of such a plan is the healthy competition within the university between its colleges, in the realm of scholarship as well as in games. This consists not only in the rivalry between collegiate student bodies but in the competition between the college corporations themselves; in the search for men for their teaching staff, in the development of new methods and equipment and all that might influence the standing of their undergraduates in the examinations and life of the university.

The experiment which I have just outlined is, of course, no longer novel. Schemes which resemble this are being tried in many places. I have been most interested in reading of a collegiate community which has been established within one of your great western universities. Lately, too, we have seen an announcement of the projection of a college within the bounds of one of your ancient universities in the East. In such plans I believe lie great possibilities. The idea of a college within a university is, after all, not really experimental. The principle has been in successful operation for centuries and is applicable *mutatis mutandis* wherever universities exist. It seems to me that if I were searching for a useful form which a gift to a large modern university anywhere might take, even after reviewing the many important objects which are the subject nowadays of

such splendid benefactions particularly in this country, I might, in the case of this imaginary university, be tempted to say to its head, "The modern university is often too vast to provide a coherent corporate existence for its undergraduates. Residential life as it prevails is frequently apt to emphasize only certain phases of human activity and to bear too little relation to the things which matter most. It is difficult, too, for the student to meet his instructors on those informal and unpremeditated occasions, when their influence is greatest. As one attempt to meet these difficulties, I would found within this university a college for a limited number of men. They shall be subject to the same examinations and academic requirements as the others who are taking courses in liberal arts. Students, however, will be admitted to the college after meeting its own standards in scholarship and personality. The college will be housed in buildings which shall possess the beauty which is part of education. It will be given a name around which will cluster the traditions which will assist the growth of a corporate solidarity among its members. The most important equipment of the college will be men—a group of selected teachers with a vocation for their work, living as senior comrades of the undergraduates."

No one in theory or in practice can afford to neglect any part of the work of a university. In the academic world of all places proper proportions must be preserved. The greatest function of the university may well be the advancement of learning through research. Highly important, too, is its trusteeship of the learned professions. Of great usefulness is its transmission of knowledge to the community through popular media. The danger, it seems to me, however, is not that any of these will be neglected, but rather that humbler and less spectacular duties may relatively suffer. There is no greater function than teaching and I would suggest, no greater peril to the modern university than that this and all that the collegiate ideal represents should be thought irrelevant. If a layman may be allowed

to say so, this ideal is not only essential in itself but one can hardly overstate the importance of the teacher in his relation to all the functions of the university. Knowledge without character is, after all, useless, if not almost dangerous. Learning without a sense of balance and proportion becomes sterile. Society needs more knowledge; this is obvious, but it stands in need of something else, the ability to use what knowledge it has. Some one has said the characteristic factor of a university is its library; that of a college its faculty. I do not think it too fanciful to suppose that the researches pursued within the library will bear a closer relation to human life when the scholar approaches them with some previous knowledge of human nature, with the feeling for proportion, perhaps too the common sense—I was going to say even the sense of humor—acquired from close association with a "human library," as a college has been well called. It is not, perhaps, without significance that both *universitas* and *collegium* meant associations of men in the pursuit of learning. The emphasis was on the men and not upon the books.

However, gentlemen, I must not ride my hobby past the point of discretion. I have been encouraged to speak of the collegiate ideal tonight, because I have the honor of meeting here some of the most distinguished trustees of that ideal. To you, gentlemen, representing the colleges of the United States, I am happy to bring the greetings of the colleges of Canada, not as a perfunctory message of goodwill, but as a salutation cordial and sincere between members of a great fraternity in which common ideals are highest and mutual understanding deepest—the salutation from teacher to teacher.

IN PRAISE OF IGNORANCE

PRESIDENT EMERITUS WILLIAM LOUIS POTEAT
Wake Forest College

I do not forget that you are the representatives of American learning, and I hope I am not an out and out boor. But if you will be generous—generosity comes easy to learning—and not account me disrespectful or guilty of a piece of impertinence, I will venture to speak to you in praise of ignorance.

When a fellow Congressman concluded his speech, Tom Reed, of Maine, remarked, "That man never speaks without adding to the sum of human ignorance." He was, I maintain, a blessing to the House of Representatives. For nothing is so embarrassing as proximity to brilliance without a cutoff, or universal intelligence beating without lapses upon your sensitive incapacity. Imagine, as Mr. Mencken does, a country housing a hundred head of Aristotles. Nature protects the over-wrought nervous system by a sheathing of callousness, under which repairs become possible. So it might be refreshing to relax the tension of your professional nerve, and turn interest for the nonce into an unaccustomed channel.

Milton speaks somewhere of "the barbarous ignorance of the schools," which consists, says our Dr. Crothers, of the scientific definition and classification of things that are not so. He adds that the exhibition of unmitigated knowledge is unseemly outside business hours, and that we should sometimes meet on the humanizing ground of not knowing. He would not like to be neighbor to a wit: it would be like being always close to a live wire. "A certain insulating film of kindly stupidity is needed to give a margin of safety to human intercourse."

The present situation and tendency seem likely to supply us with all the ignorance we require for any purpose. A

certain mountaineer eastward from Chattanooga is reported to have prayed, "O Lord, I thank thee that I'm ignorunt. Make me ignorunter!" Such a prayer would seem to be superfluous. A little while ago a distinguished university president showed us all into the same pew when he spoke of the hopeless effort of education to keep pace with our colossal and steadily increasing ignorance, and cited the slight impression which a generation's study of natural science had made on the public mind. We shall have to admit that the whole realm of science is remote from popular concern and freely peopled with ghouls and bogies; the scientist and his doings still constitute an astonishing and grotesque mystery.

Witness the survival of superstition in an age of science. We still consult the moon and mediums and palmists and witch doctors. We are calmed or terrorized by signs. We wear charms and amulets, lucky dime, buck-eye, rabbit foot.

A college professor told me that the athletic coach asked him if, during the football game about to come off, he would wear the left hind foot of a graveyard rabbit if he would supply the foot. How about the black cat that crosses the road in front of the automobile? I will give you a recipe to correct that misfortune. All you have to do is to turn your hat hind part in front so as to make the cat think really he is going behind you. I know a college professor of history who says there is no question in the world about the cat giving you the bad luck. The only question is how the cat puts it over.

A British statesman announces his belief that the Kellogg peace treaty will end war and adds, "I'd better rap wood on that." I seemed to hear something of the same sort yesterday in this room, and I was interested to see where the gentleman found the specimen. A lady's nose itches and she knows she will soon kiss a fool, when in walks her husband.

Witness, moreover, the widespread obscurantism which identifies the new learning with heresy. Witness the heated

controversies in certain religious circles about irrelevant matters long ago settled by responsible men of science. Witness the determination of public issues in local and national legislative bodies on personal and partisan considerations, with little notion of the scientific method of investigation, with little help from the universities on the discoveries of science bearing upon those issues.

And what shall we think of our complacent and bumptious provincialism in an era of intercourse? Of the Bostonian who thinks nothing ever happened west of the Hudson River? Of the Minnesotan who refuses to allow his daughter to follow her husband to a Southern college professorship because society "way down South" is backward, rude, and dangerous? And here is the United States Senate holding us aloof from the organized conscience and intelligence of mankind—not exactly aloof, for Russia, Mexico and Afghanistan are with us—the Senate insisting that international barriers long since transformed into means of communication are barriers still ordained of God and George Washington, ignoring international relations except those which involve advantages and no obligations, and, with the stupidity which would shame a high-school boy, maintaining that the cooperation of independent nations against the crime of war and for the promotion of their common interests is a compromise of their sovereignty, rather than an assertion of it.

Now I will "cam" down.

The trouble seems to be that the children troop forward so fast we are not able to get our psychic inheritance adequately over to them. We secure their literacy, but not their enlightenment. We stuff with facts those we overtake but develop no wisdom in the use of them, no judgment of values. They acquire, but do not think. We feed them the applications of science too fast to chew or digest, with the result of confusion and discomfort. They get the machine, the weapon, but the will to use it to right ends they want. And so our industrial and economic suc-

cess seems not to enrich the spirit of man. We still choose inferior enjoyments and trivial pursuits. In short, the "educated" are not educated.

Another explanation may be offered. Institutions of learning conserve, extend, and publish learning. They conserve it securely, for they are great traditionalists, rabbi quoting rabbi endlessly, though some of its treasures do seem to be leaking away. The function of extension also is genuinely discharged here and there. Some of the added items are, indeed, very small potatoes and very lonesome, but they may make more and better the next generation. "Produce, produce!" shouts Carlyle; "out with it then!" An exhortation hardly needed, for the discoverer may be counted on to publish. So eager is he, in fact, that he sometimes publishes what he has not discovered. But quite commonly the publication is a burial. The thing is laid to rest under the cement of a technical phraseology which nobody can penetrate, not even the worker in the next cemetery plot. And when a man undertakes to translate this jargon and cause the people to understand, the researchers dub him *popularizer* with the tone of disdain and the suggestion that he is but a wooden spoon, perhaps a charlatan.

The practical result is, we are left in ignorance. If anybody wants any of this precious commodity, he must go up to the places where it is kept—the "institutions of learning"—and buy some. And 97 per cent of the population do not go up to buy. What do they know or care about the assured results of science? Accordingly, the demagogue and the propagandist have a rollicking time with this nation of seventh graders. Part of the responsibility for this low level of intelligence is ours, and many of us will have to bear the odium of maintaining a discreet silence when Fundamentalism led the unenlightened back to the wilderness and pilloried American intelligence in the gaze of all the world. We are still reaping the harvest of our neglect and "discretion." Remember the Arkansas

referendum but two months ago. Remember unrevoked resolutions of religious bodies dictating by majority vote in mass meeting what other men must think. Remember the frank admission of publishers that public school texts on science are changed on the demand of Fundamentalist opinion. And remember that this propaganda of obscurantism is but just begun. Florida and Kansas and Oklahoma and Colorado are scheduled next to follow the lead of Arkansas. For the youth of all America fetters are now forging, and unless the colleges and universities interpose with address and vigor, we can expect nothing but disloyalty and execration when in passionate disgust these fetters come to be broken, as they surely will.

But I call you to consider how the body of knowledge itself appears to be falling to pieces, how science declines into nescience. Not a little of the science of thirty years ago the science of today seems to have discredited. Things have been smashed to atoms including the atom. That ultimate indivisible unit of matter has now been resolved into a sort of solar system consisting of a central sun of positive charges of electricity called protons and an equal number of charges of negative electricity called electrons revolving as planets at the speed of 1400 miles a second. The "elements" are now found to be not only composite, but transmutable. The straight line is curved. The conservation of energy and mass does not conserve universally. There is a fourth dimension, though what it does to space and time I do not know. The stately law of gravitation shows signs of an unseemly levity. At a recent scientific meeting a paper was read on "The Vacuum, There Is Something In It." What Huxley considered the most fundamental and universal antithesis in nature, matter and force, no longer exists.

It reminds me of the answer to a theological question. A man asked the preacher, "What was dat you said in yoah sermon 'bout de cherubims an' seraphims?"

He said, "Doan you understand dat, niggah?"

"No, I doan understand dat. What's de diff'rence 'tween de cherubims an' de seraphims?"

The preacher said, "Dat's easy. Dere used to be a diff'rence 'tween 'em, but dey made it up."

So matter and force appear to have compounded their differences and merged into electricity—but what is that?

What is a plain man to think? Is science a modern Saturn devouring its own children! Has science kicked its own bottom out, or only opened new abysses of mystery? In any case, we now know that we do not know as much as we thought we knew. We have been accumulating ignorance rapidly of late.

But, come to think of it, the discovery of a mistake is not ignorance. It is discovery, an item of new knowledge and the token of more to follow. The moment between the discovery of a mistake and its correction may be a moment of darkness, but it is a prophecy of light. Such moments in the progress of science have been scored against it as a reproach and a demonstration of its unreliability. A book in biology or physics ten years old is out of date, it is said, and today's authoritative deliverance is likely to be changed tomorrow. But this attitude of devotion to truth, not to past formulations of truth, is precisely the ground of confidence in science. Some men like the cozy comfort of tradition, securely barred against the chill and disorder of invasion from without. Give me the open windows and the fresh airs blowing in from everywhere. For God is in His world, in every quarter of it. And there can be nothing so excellent or so commanding as to have Him blow in on our smug conceit with a new revelation in the light of which our garnered knowledge looks like ignorance.

Think of another beautiful and promising aspect of our ignorance. Some forty years ago science was in high conceit with its omnipotent method and apparatus. It had been observing objects and processes with sacrificial devotion and care by means of the senses assisted by instruments of marvellous range and precision. There resulted

a wholly new imaginative conception of the universe, revised intellectual and moral attitudes, and a body of specific recorded knowledge beside which the acquisitions of all preceding time appear meagre and unimportant. To the scientific mind of the period the universe seemed a closed system of inviolable sequences, impersonal and its own sufficient cause. It showed no trace of intelligence or will. God was pushed off the last ledge of mechanical fact. The supernatural was rolled up as a scroll and thrown over the edge of the world into the abyss. Science was well advanced in plucking the heart of mystery out of nature, and a few more years of the unflinching application of the laws of physics and chemistry would finish the business up and set men free from the last superstition. Toward other disciplines many men of science showed a degree of arrogance and disdain.

Now, next after finding out what we can do, it is important to find out what we cannot do. About the year 1885 men of science began to recognize their limitations. Their confident and supercilious bearing began to soften and relax. They saw that they had been dealing with surface problems, whose solution merely led them in to the central mysteries, and before these mysteries they stood in helpless impotence. That is the situation in every field of investigation. Even the haughty queen of the sciences, mathematics, if we may trust Bertrand Russell, one of the brilliant mathematicians of the time, "is the subject in which we never know what we are talking about, nor whether what we are saying is true." Sir Oliver Lodge has a book on the reality of the ether, but other eminent physicists deny its existence. Those who assume its existence are able to get no further in defining it than Lord Salisbury: "Ether is the nominative case of the verb to undulate." If you ask Sir Oliver why when one end of a rod is pushed the other end moves, he answers that it is inexplicable as yet. And *Punch* extends the realm of mystery by adding that it is equally inexplicable that when

one end of a man is trodden upon the other end shouts. Your chemist records the sequence of events in his test-tubes. He does not know why this sequence rather than another, or why any sequence. His chemical affinity is a name to cover ignorance, as "affinity" in the social realm is a name to cover something else. Huxley wrote a famous essay on the physical basis of life. Ask your biologist of today what life is, and you will find he knows no more than Huxley did. And here is the field of personality, now at length included in the natural realm. The physical principles and tests which break down at the interesting, the crucial, point in the investigation of things are even more disappointing when applied to thoughts, to memory, emotion, faith, which constitute personality. Plato and St. Francis and Shakespeare have clearly a place in the natural order, and a science of the sum of things must include them within its purview. If it cannot account for this highest term of the natural series, personality, one might ask whether it has accounted for anything. Even the conceptual apparatus for handling the phenomena of personality remains to be invented. Ether and electron and ion and quantum, the unit of radiant energy, are manifestly inapplicable. There is no algebra of love. The attraction which draws two souls together does not vary inversely as the square of the distance.

Accordingly, the crucial questions in all the fields of physical nature, no less than those of personality, are questions still. The word which best fits the lip of physicist, chemist, biologist, psychologist, is *nescio,* I do not know. The great scientists—the minor scientists we may ignore, as we need not read the minor poets—admit their limitations and now agree that there are spheres of reality to which their tests and instruments are inappropriate.

Here, again, the recognition of our ignorance is wholesome and beneficent. It pricks the balloon of our conceit, and we sink into teachableness and reverence. Besides, we

have the challenge of the unknown, and the adventure of the immortal quest of truth is yet before us.

Manifestly science cannot discredit faith. The deeper things of nature and life are at least for the present beyond its plummet. I know a gentleman of some distinction demanded within the past two or three weeks that the conception of God be revised, and he insisted that the revision should be on the basis of the science of sociology and astrophysics, or mechanics. The gentleman is proposing to build a lighthouse on shifting sand, on the surge of the sea. He might at least wait until sociology had established a basis for itself, until mechanics had discovered where it might rest, for matter is no matter now. Materialism has lost what scientific support it once appeared to have. Almost unanimously men are taking the opposite attitude. They are feeling that a system of things out of which mind arose must itself at bottom be mental; that the order of the universe suggests an Infinite Intelligence, its beauty an Infinite Artist, its invisible ministries an Infinite Friend. They have done little beyond presenting examples of the miraculous, lifting the curtain on wonder. Huxley said that a man who appreciates all that is implied in the falling of a stone can have no difficulty about any doctrine simply on account of its marvellousness. And we have to thank the scientists for a greater universe and a greater God. With a clearer and ampler radiance the heavens declare the glory of God, and the solid firmament of the Psalmist, resolved now into the expanse of illimitable universes of stars, shows the Divine handiwork with a new and overwhelming impressiveness.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS*

PRESIDENT ERNEST H. WILKINS
Oberlin College, Chairman

PART I

The Training of Graduate Students for College Teaching

A

The Commission recommends that the Association transmit to the Graduate Schools of those institutions which are members of the Association of American Universities all that follows under this heading:

The Association of American Colleges, consisting of those institutions which as a whole constitute the major source from which graduate students are derived and as a whole afford the major field of life-occupation for the graduates of graduate schools, earnestly requests the Graduate Schools of Arts and Sciences of the United States to give consideration to the following suggestions, approved by the Association at its annual meeting, January 12, 1929:

1. That each Graduate School ascertain the proportion of its own graduates (recipients of the Ph.D. or equivalent degree) engaged in college teaching (limiting the inquiry, should it seem preferable, to graduates of the last ten years).

2. That each Graduate School ascertain the proportion of its present doctoral candidates intending to engage in college teaching.

3. That in the light of the facts thus ascertained each Graduate School inquire of itself whether it is doing all that it can rightly do to train its students for the profession of college teaching.

We believe that the two major elements in the graduate training of prospective college teachers should continue to be mastery of the content of the subject to be taught and

* Adopted by the Association of American Colleges, January 12, 1929. For action relative to subsequent reports see the Minutes of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting, p. 181.

some experience in research within the field of the subject to be taught.

As suggestions of our own toward the perfecting of the graduate training of prospective college teachers we offer the following.

4. We suggest that each Graduate School regularly ascertain from its doctoral candidates, at the time of their entrance into the Graduate School or soon thereafter, whether or not they intend to engage in college teaching.

5. Since the college teacher should have a broad range of intellectual interest and experience, for the sake of both his students and his colleagues, we suggest that no Graduate School admit to candidacy for the doctorate any student intending to engage in college teaching who has not a broad range of intellectual interest and experience. We do not consider it to be within the task of the Graduate School to give such interest and experience, which should in general be obtained before the beginning of graduate work; but we do believe that in the case of a student intending to engage in college teaching who has not such interest and experience the Graduate School should require that he obtain them—presumably, but not necessarily, through collegiate study for which no graduate credit should be given—before the student is admitted to candidacy for the doctorate.

6. Since the college teacher has not merely the responsibility of knowing but has also the responsibility of conveying his knowledge and of stimulating other minds, we suggest that carefully considered effort be made—as is already done in many cases—to give to each graduate student intending to engage in college teaching an adequate training in methods of teaching as applied to the particular department of knowledge in which the student is working. We suggest further, in this connection, that so far as possible opportunity be provided for graduate students to watch the teaching of successful college teachers; and that in so far as graduate students are themselves employed as instructors or assistants such employment be supervised and be regarded as part of their own educational experience.

7. Since the college enterprise is a single enterprise in which every college teacher should bear his part, and since every college teacher should have a good general understanding of the enterprise as a whole, we suggest that each Graduate School offer to students intending to engage in

college teaching an adequate and varied course on the American College. Such a course should deal in particular with progressive instructional and curricular movements; and should include some account of the main types of departmental and general administrative service. We do not suggest that such a course be made a requirement; but we do suggest that each department be urged to accept such a course toward the meeting of its own quantitative requirements.

8. While we believe that significant experience in the field of research should be given to every prospective college teacher, we believe that the graduate schools in general now tend to stress unduly the relative importance of such experience for students intending to engage in college teaching; and we therefore suggest that for such students there be an optional quantitative relaxation of the research requirement in favor of some additional mastery of subject-matter or of other educational resources. Such relaxation might take the form of the assignment of presumably smaller and shorter thesis problems.

9. Since college officers seeking instructors often deal directly with the heads of departments in Graduate Schools, and since such college officers need all possible evidence with regard to the teaching ability of each candidate, we suggest that departmental heads regard it as a part of their task to acquaint themselves with all readily ascertainable evidence as to the teaching ability of their graduate students.

B

The Commission recommends that the Association adopt the following resolution:

College officers seeking new instructors from among graduate students or recent graduate students should make insistent inquiry of the Graduate School representatives with whom they deal as to the training and experience of the candidate with respect to teaching.

Part II

The Training of Young Instructors in Respect to Teaching

A

The Commission recommends that the Association adopt the following resolution:

The development of the teaching ability of newly appointed instructors is a major responsibility of the College.

B

The Commission recommends that the Association make to each of its constituent members the following recommendation:

That every college maintain a standing committee on the improvement of instruction, which committee shall have as a major responsibility the making of local plans for the development of the teaching ability of newly appointed instructors.

C

The Commission offers herewith a series of specific suggestions in this connection and recommends that the Association transmit them to each of its member institutions with the general approval of the Association. It is understood that these suggestions will differ in local applicability.

1. That for every newly appointed instructor there be a faculty adviser, who should in general be either the head of the department concerned or another member of the department, designated by the head.

2. That the process of advice be centered mainly, not on classroom visitation, but on the making and reviewing of periodic reports by the young instructor on his work. For such reports no form should be used. They should state informally the results achieved during the period under review; should indicate clearly the problems met; and should contain plans for continuing work. They should contain as well individual analyses of problems of various members of the class—some or all—with respect chiefly to particular difficulties met, but with respect also to special abilities and any other matters of notable personal interest.

3. That if classroom visitation by the adviser take place, it should take place as a method of getting light on problems or plans previously considered in the reports, and by previous agreement between the instructor and the adviser; and, that if it take place at all, it be sufficiently frequent to remove any sense of abnormality.

4. That, whenever appropriate, the course in which the main work is done by a newly appointed instructor be regarded in fact and in name as a cooperative course, the newly appointed instructor and his adviser being the cooperators.

5. That newly appointed instructors be invited and expected occasionally to attend classes taught by older suc-

cessful teachers in their own department or in allied departments.

6. That, just so far as may be possible, newly appointed instructors be invited to cooperate by occasional lectures or otherwise in the advanced courses of the department.

7. That there be held occasional staff conferences of allied departments (or, in a large institution, of a single department) for the discussion of instructional problems.

8. That in the case of a course having several sections, one man be designated as responsible for the conduct of the course as a whole, and that he maintain a reasonable degree of coordination in the work of the several sections.

9. That annual reports of the work of newly appointed instructors be made by departmental heads to the committee on the improvement of instruction referred to above.

Editorial Note

In presenting the first part of the report, President Wilkins referred particularly to two articles by Dean M. E. Haggerty, of the University of Minnesota: "The Professional Training of College Teachers," *North Central Association Quarterly,* Vol. II, p. 108 ff., and "Occupational Destination of Ph.D. Recipients," a report prepared for the Committee on Professional Training of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, *The Educational Record,* Vol. IX, No. 4, p. 209 ff.

Discussion of the first part of the report was opened by President J. L. McConaughy and Dean M. S. Brown, as members of the Commission. The discussion was then continued by Dean Haggerty and Dr. Kelly. Dr. Kelly also read a statement prepared by President Few regarding plans of Duke University for giving training in teaching to its graduate students.

President Wilkins then presented the second part of the report. Discussion of this part of the report was opened by Dean O. E. Randall, and President McConaughy on behalf of Dean C. L. Raper, as members of the Commission. In the discussion which followed the following gentlemen

participated: Dean Kent and Presidents Marsh, Rammelkamp, J. H. Apple, Rainey, Antrim, Davidson, Blackwell, H. L. McCracken, and Storms.

The report as first presented contained, after the first sentence of the paragraph numbered 6 in Part I, the following sentence: "We believe that such training should in general be given rather by the department in which the student is working than by a separate Department or School of Education—though we believe that advice and help may well be sought from a Department or School of Education." And, after the second sentence of the paragraph numbered 7, the following sentence: "Such a course should presumably be given by a Department or School of Education."

In the course of the discussion it became clear that, while the report in general met with hearty approval, several members of the Association questioned the wisdom of the inclusion of these two sentences. The point was made that the Association might seem to be exceeding the bounds of legitimate and courteous suggestion if, in addition to indicating to the Graduate Schools what the Association believes those Schools should do, the Association should further seem to prescribe to them just how they should do it. Recognizing the validity of this point, the Commission itself withdrew the two sentences from the report.

The report was then, in accordance with the established procedure, referred to the Committee on Resolutions. On the following morning, being favorably reported by that Committee with the exclusion of the two sentences above referred to, it was adopted by the Association unanimously and with hearty approval.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND COLLEGE TEACHING

PRESIDENT W. P. FEW
Duke University

I hesitate to report for Duke University; for the reason that we are just at the beginning of graduate instruction and I am mindful of the ancient injunction, "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." On the other hand, being at the beginning we have certain advantages. Indeed, our chief difficulty is that we cannot start with our slate clean enough. The chief difficulty we are finding in bringing about any kind of educational reform lies in the practices and the prestige of well-established institutions and the bias of one kind or another that our own teachers have brought from well-established institutions of this and other countries.

If we are to consider what a graduate school ought to do perhaps we should first ask what a graduate school ought to be. I think our Graduate School should follow the same general lines that are followed in the best American graduate schools; but as our plans mature, we ought to separate more sharply between the college and the graduate school and give to the work of the graduate school a more distinctively university character than has heretofore been the rule in this country. And, in our efforts to meet the varying needs of those men who would fit themselves primarily for the business of college teaching, and, on the other hand, the needs of those who would give their first concern to research and scholarship, we ought also to differentiate clearly both in the type of graduate school teacher and in the courses and methods of instruction, though I am strongly opposed to two types of degrees or two kinds of standards for the Ph.D. degree.

While our Graduate School should keep prominent the purpose to discover and develop men who have some special

fitness for the business of college teaching, still, under circumstances as they exist in our part of the country, a large proportion of the men and resources of our Graduate School should be devoted to research and the advancement of knowledge, not undertaking, however, too many things, but emphasizing certain selected fields, such, for example, as the natural sciences and the social sciences. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy from Duke University will be a guarantee that the person who has received that degree has had thorough training in a particular field of knowledge and has demonstrated his ability to advance knowledge by doing research and presenting a creditable thesis.

But a man may get this degree and not be recommended for college teaching. In connection with the work in the Graduate School leading to the Ph.D. degree, men who expect to do college teaching will need teaching "clinics," just as the intending physician needs his clinics; and Duke University will not recommend for positions in college teaching even the men who hold the Ph.D. degree unless they have also availed themselves of opportunities provided here or elsewhere to test and develop their teaching ability, and have shown that they have some fitness for college teaching. Duke University will provide these opportunities in connection with its own college classes. For underclassmen, that is especially for freshmen and sophomores, our teachers are chosen on account of their personal qualities and teaching power as well as for knowledge of their subjects, and excellence in teaching wins promotion as surely as so-called productive scholarship. In connection with these classes we expect to provide both observation and practice in college teaching. We have provided some simple machinery by which this can be carried out.

Our plan is, briefly, to ask each department to appoint a faculty member or a committee to have in charge the question of teacher training. This committee is expected to establish contacts with graduate students who intend to enter the teaching profession, to provide so far as pos-

sible opportunities for them to gain practical experience, to supervise such practice work, to arrange for seminar sessions devoted to the problems of teaching, and to keep records of the qualifications of graduate students who may wish to be recommended for teaching positions. It is hoped that this experiment will accomplish something toward improving the teaching ability of those who receive degrees from our Graduate School and who intend to become college teachers.

To sum up: We shall expect those who receive degrees in our Graduate School to demonstrate the ability to carry on research and to advance knowledge, but we purpose to discriminate in selecting our degree holders to be recommended for college teaching positions. And after all, it is not certain that we can make good teachers; for teachers are born as well as made. But it certainly will help to have young men in their graduate school years confront the problems of college teaching, observe good teachers (and the hardest part of it for us, as for all universities, will be to make sure that we have these really good teachers for our students to observe), and, when they are ready for it and under proper supervision, have some part in the handling of well-taught classes. All this will only be serviceable to the man for his first two or three years of college teaching. After that his success as a teacher will depend entirely upon his individual development, his interest in human beings, as well as interest in the subject matter he undertakes to teach; in short, in his personal qualities and teaching power.

GREAT TEACHERS

And Methods of Developing Them*

Robert L. Kelly

The executive and administrative officers of the colleges affiliated with nineteen church boards of education were asked to cooperate in a study of two phases of college teaching.

The first phase had to do with those individuals referred to on any college campus as "great teachers." It is a rare college that has not had or does not have some "great teachers." The second phase was concerned with the methods used by the college officers in the building of their faculties. No effort has been made as yet to trace the possible relationships between these two phases of the subject.

A total of 187 colleges participated in the investigation regarding the great teachers, and a total of 162 in the study of the methods of building college faculties. Probably 200 colleges were concerned in both studies. Of this number something less than one-third are listed by the Association of American Universities, and a majority of the others are approved by the various regional associations. The purpose, however, was to secure the attitude toward the questions involved of those institutions which are affiliated with the church boards of education which compose the Council of Church Boards of Education and which therefore are definitely committed to what is called Christian education.

It is not claimed that the pictures secured are composite pictures of all American colleges, nor ideal pictures for the colleges cooperating. The camera was pointed to portions of the field and the results secured were the results secured. The data assembled disclose some unexpected results.

I. "Great Teachers"

It was doubted whether there was really general agreement as to who were the college's "great teachers," and the

* See page 214 for tabulations prepared by Miss Ruth E. Anderson, assistant in the office of the Association.

college officials were asked to indicate who they were—members of the administration, the faculty, the students, or the alumni—that looked upon these mythical or real persons as properly singled out for such academic distinction. Of more than 160 replies, all of which seemed to recognize the species, about 70 per cent reported that they were estimated as "great teachers" by all four classes of the college membership—administration, faculty, students and alumni. There were more than 20 per cent of the replies, indicating as many colleges, in which these prophets were not without honor among everybody except their colleagues. The teachers so isolated for honors were more frequently placed on pedagogical pedestals by various combinations of the other three college membership units than by a combination that included the faculty.

The original plan of the study was to test out with a degree of completeness the other groups of college representatives, namely, the faculties, the students and the alumni with the same schedules. This has been done partly and the results have been tabulated, although they do not appear in this presentation. However, it was discovered that the task was so formidable that it could not be accomplished adequately, at least at present.

There was a hypothesis that the so-called "great teacher" was largely a fabrication of the imagination. That the great teachers were neither born great nor achieved greatness, but that their greatness was thrust upon them by the administration for publicity purposes, or by alumni in their moments of sentimental reminiscence, and that the greatness of the teachers increased directly as the distance from the students' graduation dates. One of the most eminent college presidents in our Association wrote: "I do not think the data which would result from this inquiry would be of any real value. The men named in most cases would be definitely men of the old-fashioned type; few, if any, would be Ph.D.'s; few, if any, would have had educational training. Their success in their day and gen-

eration would not indicate at all that the same combination of characteristics would achieve a corresponding success today."

Our findings indicate that it is not safe to prejudge an investigation. A few great teachers were reported for the decades of the nineteenth century—even so far back as 1841–50. But there were many more reported for the twentieth century than the nineteenth; there were more reported for the decade 1911–20 than for any other. The numbers for 1901–1910 exceeded the numbers for 1891–1900, and these in turn exceeded those for 1881–1890. Of course, the results might have been different if the reporting officers had been the alumni rather than the administrative officers. Perhaps the opinion of the officers of administration should be more reliable than that of the alumni. In any event, it appears that not all great teachers are dead teachers. The reports bear out the assertion of one of our correspondents that the great teachers are well distributed throughout the history of the college.

Among the teachers under consideration in these colleges it was found that 142 of them had the Doctor's degree. Within this list are included a few with Sc.D., Ped.D. and M.D. degrees. Also, the same number were reported as having the M.A. or M.S. degree. As to the universities from which these degrees were secured, Chicago is named more than any other one institution, followed very closely by Columbia, and after that, in order, by Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Yale, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and others, to the total of forty-one different institutions.

More great teachers, 68, were reported in the field of English and English literature than in any other field; mathematics ranks next, 57, followed by philosophy, 44; Greek, 42; Latin, 40; history, 36; biology, 30; chemistry, 29; Bible, 24; science, 20; education, 17; social science, 13; German, 12, and psychology, 12. If to what is reported definitely as "social science" were added economics, sociology, political science and government, the total would

equal that of history, 36, and if history and social science, thus broadly conceived, were combined, this group would take the first place. If to Bible were added religion, New Testament, theology and other kindred subjects this group would be in the same rank as history, 36. Forty-five different subjects were mentioned in which these teachers achieved distinction. As one correspondent remarked, "It is not a matter of subjects, but of teachers."

In view of the popular impression that "the great teacher" in student estimate at least is the easy mark, the question was asked: *Were some of their courses "snap" courses?* There were 159 answers to the question, 132 of which were in the negative and 17 in the affirmative. This decided landslide upward will take most people unawares.

The prediction turned out to be true that most of these teachers had not had training in a school of education. There were 110 negative answers to the question, 23 positive answers, and with 28 the answers were somewhat ambiguous. In the last group were listed replies involving both positive and negative answers.

In view of the often repeated declaration that there is better teaching in the high school than in the college, the question was put: *Have they had high school teaching experience?* The answers broke about even. Forty-four said positively "Yes;" 62 "No," and there were 51 of a miscellaneous character, indicating that some did and some did not.

In view of popular criticism one of the surprises came in the matter of research. Only 45 answers out of 158 were positively to the effect that their teachers were not also carrying on research as well as teaching. There were 69 positive answers in the affirmative, and a certain amount of ambiguity in 44. Sixty-five of our correspondents advised that the research had resulted in publication, though, of course, the type of publication was not stipulated. At least there was no disposition on the part of 40 per cent of our

correspondents to ignore research as an important feature of successful teaching.

A considerably larger number of replies, 94, indicated that fruitful student contacts were more often to be found than publication as a result of the researches the teacher had made. Approximately 85 per cent of those who engaged in research were noted for their fruitful student contacts.

As a further effort to elicit judgments concerning the real teaching capacity of these men and women, the question was asked: *Did they teach their subjects, or did they devote much of their time in class to a discussion of questions of philosophical interest, or relating to the "problems of life?"* Of the 161 answers, 68 reported the teaching of the subjects, including "mainly" and "primarily," while 62 others reported that they taught both the subject and general questions of philosophical interest. Only six answers indicated essential discursiveness on the part of the teachers. Practically all the answers indicated a broad sympathy with life and with the institutions of life on the part of the teachers. Apparently, these teachers were not simply technicians. One correspondent remarked: "Great teachers never separate these two items."

As another indication of their breadth of interest and sympathy were the answers to the question: *Did they relate their subjects to the other subjects in the curriculum?* Only eight answered "No;" 122 "Yes." Twenty-three other answers indicated an intermediary position.

A still further effort was made to provoke a discriminating judgment by the question: *Were they "great" on account of their personality and character regardless of skill in teaching?* Seventy-three correspondents felt that their personality, character, etc., largely carried them through to distinction, and 29 believed that both were essential factors in the case. Only 26 answered in the negative. Very few cared to estimate the teacher purely on the basis of skill in teaching alone.

Only three of the executives report great teachers who did not have a positive religious influence. One hundred and thirty-eight answered unequivocally "Yes." There were 19 whose answers were divided among different teachers.

Our correspondents went further and indicated the terms in which the positive religious influence was measured by them. Eighty of them referred to the effect upon students and on college life, and to the effect upon alumni in later life of the example, character, ideals, class attitudes, teaching, personal contacts, etc., while 27 placed emphasis upon church relationships, attendance at chapel, activity in the Y. M. C. A. and other organizations of this sort. Eighteen based their replies upon the testimony of students, alumni, citizens and general opinion; half as many others by the influence upon the vocational choice of students.

As to the question, *Were they distinguished scholars?* there was about an even break, 63 positively "Yes"; 69 positively "No," and 28 divided between different teachers.

In answer to the question, *To what extent did these teachers stimulate the students to frequent the library?* 67 said "constant use," "large extent," "greatly," "to a marked degree," etc. Nineteen replied, "considerably," "some," "to a considerable extent," etc. That our correspondents with few exceptions consider this a true test of a good teacher is evident from the almost universally favorable testimony.

To the question, *To what extent did their students go on for graduate work or professional study?* 147 answers were given. Seven reported "not particularly," "limited," "to a slight extent," etc. Four reported "average," "fair number," etc. Forty-one answered in terms of "many," "large per cent," "very largely," etc.; 36 said "to a considerable extent," "good number," "good per cent," "above average," etc. Fourteen replied in terms of definite per cents which range from 5 to 80 or more.

When it came to the qualities, attitudes and methods that were given the highest rating, 34 were unable to reply. Of the 128 who attempted an estimate, the following qualities or traits led: interest in students, knowledge or mastery of subject, personality, and character. Forty-three other traits were mentioned from eleven to two times, and sixty-four others once each. Probably many of these could be classified under those first listed. Since, however, there is no general agreement as to what traits make up personality or character the matter must be left at present largely as it stands.

As to methods, one correspondent said: "Great teachers are superior to method," while others mentioned clear presentation, class discussion, questions, socialized recitation, research, concise assignments, not to limit amount of student preparation, inspirational lectures, etc.

II—Faculty Building

The second inquiry was couched in terms of the methods in vogue by the college authorities in building their faculties.

To the question, *What are you doing to enlist your own best students for college teaching?* there was almost universal response. Only 16 colleges admitted that they are pursuing a *laissez-faire* policy. There were over forty different varieties of answers, no one of which represented half of the colleges. Seventy-three colleges pin their faith or part of their faith to the graduate schools. Of this number 61 encourage their promising students to go on for graduate work and 12 aid them in securing fellowships or scholarships for that purpose. Twenty-eight of them report forms of "personal evangelism" in the interest of the cause —direct conferences, or other individual efforts carried on by the president, dean, major advisers, heads of departments, and other faculty members. Twenty-two profess to utilize their own courses in education as a means of pro-

moting the profession on a college level. Only 15 of the colleges report the use of assistantships and instructorships as a means of developing professional personnel, and only eight mention various forms of vocational advice. One college reports its effort to guide students in self-discovery.

Among the other means mentioned are a scholarship recognition service held semi-annually, an annual conference with the Dean of the Graduate School, the stimulation of interest through an educational fraternity, the maintenance of personal contacts with former students doing work in graduate schools, and reliance upon the zeal of teachers to reproduce their kind. One college pays a minimum of $2,000 per year to instructors, while another advises that the atmospheric condition of the institution is surcharged with the educational spirit and many teachers are sent out.

In the effort to come a little more closely to grips with the problem in hand, the question was asked: *To what extent are you developing your faculty* (*a*) *from your own students?* (*b*) *From your own staff?*

(a) The methods of developing the faculty from the students are considered first.

Per cent of Faculty who are Alumni	Number of Institutions
10 or less	17
11–20	15
21–30	16
31–40	7
41–50	6
51–60	2
75	1

Only two colleges definitely state that they have no policy in this matter, and one of these said "No plan yet developed." A few colleges state their fear of inbreeding, but for the most part this fear results only in the limitation of the number of their own students on the faculty. To this

question there were approximately fifty different kinds of answers. Fifty-four colleges gave per cents or figures from which per cents could be computed.

Nineteen others reported definitely numbers, ranging from one to eight, of alumni on the faculty. Seventeen employed such terms as "largely," "a majority," "several," "fair proportion," "normal proportion" in answering this question.

(b) From your own staff?

Seventy-nine colleges either made no answer or made answers meaningless to the tabulator. If this means that 79 colleges are not vitally concerned with the development of their own staff it indicates an appalling situation. Some of the data to be presented later may be interpreted as indicating that in the estimation of many of the colleges under consideration the election to a professorship registers the end of the concern of the college in the man's professional development. The range of those answers which indicate an attempt at constructive measures is much narrower than in the two questions preceding and yet most of these answers are ambiguous or evasive. A few colleges admit they are more interested in the young men whom they may secure than in the men they already have. A few colleges report in terms of ratios a definite policy of developing their faculties from their staff: 1–4 per cent, 1–25 per cent, 1–33⅓ per cent, 3–50 per cent. There are a few specific methods of promotion given. Five colleges speak of concrete plans of procedure which are here inserted:

> Each summer we allot $200 each to five teachers, to enable them to spend not less than six weeks in some university in this country or abroad studying in the department in which they are serving the college. Also we appropriate $500 each summer to each of two teachers for the purpose of summer travel.
>
> We encourage sabbatical leave and possibly a semester's leave with salary for promising young teachers, who need more graduate work.

For those holding the Doctor's degree we allow a maximum of $300 for summer work in good universities.

We have a definite purpose to keep one instructor in graduate school on half salary each year; three instructors on full salary for summer study, and one professor on honorarium of $150 for study each summer.

The college appropriates for graduate study $200 each (in summer session) for five of our best teachers.

The infrequency of references to sabbatic leave is the most amazing feature of this part of the investigation. Only 56 colleges mentioned their efforts to encourage graduate study in summer terms, by leaves of absence, and sabbatical leaves, and of this number only 16 gave assurance that these leaves were with financial aid.

Almost every college answered Question 3: *How long have you kept your best teachers? Explain.* The actual length of time ranges from one to sixty-three years, with the average minimum and maximum terms of service being respectively twelve and twenty-eight years. There were 145 attempted explanations for the tenure of service. Many of the institutions seem to consider length of service in itself a virtue. The explanations are couched in such language as to raise some doubts. "Best teachers seem to consider themselves fixtures and are not much inclined to leave." "Not a marked disposition of teachers of college to make changes." "Few leave who become established." "Believe in long tenture." "Some are being retained with a view to long tenure." There is a remarkable number of professors who have held their positions ten, twenty, thirty, forty and even fifty years. One wonders if the long tenure illustrates the law of inertia.

On the other hand, there are indications that long tenure is bought with a price for service actually rendered to the institution. "Usually able to hold the ones we consider most desirable." "Do not expect to lose good teachers."

"The best have built themselves into the institution." "Match offers received by strong teachers." "It is our purpose to render them any assistance we can if they are worthy of promotion, and if we cannot care for them within the organization we will certainly help them to gain what is their due somewhere else."

The time has certainly come for challenging long tenure for the sake of long tenure. Two or three colleges reported that some of their best men stayed only a few years, but not a single college announced the policy of securing young teachers of exceptional parts with the expectation in advance that they could not keep them very long but with the hope and belief that a short stay by them might surcharge the faculty for a generation.

Have you found it especially advantageous for college teachers to have had high school experience?

All but seven of the colleges answered this question. Seventy-eight of our correspondents answered an unequivocal, "Yes," and 63 an equally unequivocal, "No." Evidently a large majority, therefore, do not at present attach particular significance to this consideration. If it is true, as is often claimed, that the teaching in the high schools is superior to that in the colleges, this superiority has not sufficiently impressed these colleges as to impel them to seek instructors with high school experience. No doubt the officials of junior colleges would answer the question differently.

A really surprising result is registered in the answers to the question, *Do you prefer to have college teachers with educational training?* One hundred and eighty-five of the 187 colleges answered, and 117 gave an unequivocal, "Yes." Twenty more answered equivocally, "Yes." But 22 answered unequivocally, "No," and three equivocally, "No."

What proportion of your teachers are "college-minded" rather than "department-minded?"

A distinguished college president declined to answer the question on the ground that "No one under heaven could

answer such an inquiry. A long discussion as to the meaning of the term 'college-minded' must precede any answer and no committee would agree on the exact proportion." There were only five others, however, who declared themselves unable to answer the question, and 10 who ignored the inquiry. To the officers of 110 colleges this evidently is a question with a significant meaning since they undertake to state their replies in terms of ratios which are set forth for what they are worth in the following tabulation:

Per cent of Teachers "College-minded"	Number of Institutions
25 or less	17
26–50	34
51–75	25
76–100	34

Here we have a definite recognition of faculty men who are able to look over the fence, which is at variance with the common verdict that colleges in general are too rigidly departmentalized. The inference seems to be that in many faculties students are being taught as well as subjects. One college president believes that probably most of his best teachers have the general interest of the college in mind as much as department interest.

In the opinion of several administrators the younger members of the faculty still under the influence of the graduate schools are more likely to be department-minded than those with longer records in college teaching.

The seventh question had to do with criteria of promotion. *Do you promote teachers on the basis of* (*a*) *good teaching?* (*b*) *Of research and publication?*

Only six colleges failed to answer section (a) of the question, while 34 failed to answer section (b). One hundred and eight profess to promote—primarily, of course, it is understood—on the basis of good teaching and seven pri-

marily on the basis of research. Two report that they do not promote on the basis of good teaching, one of them adding, "but we should," while 57 do not promote on the basis of research and publication. Forty-six promote on both bases and two on neither. It is evident, therefore, that the colleges in question hold general agreement with a group of research men, representing the leading learned societies of the country, recently in session at Washington, who without exception asserted that their own best college teachers were of the inspirational sort (whom they named) and not at all or necessarily men engaged either in research or publication.

To give an air of scientific completeness to this summary we should add that one executive gave the rather startling information, "Do not promote on any basis," while another answered, "Practically no promotion."

The eighth question was, *From what graduate schools do you get your best teachers?*

One hundred and thirty-three institutions were named as sources of "best teachers." As several of those specified are not graduate schools, there are no doubt a number of "best teachers" who did no graduate work. On the basis of the frequency with which they were named the leading universities rank: University of Chicago 93, Columbia 70, Harvard 44, Johns Hopkins 29, Cornell 25, Illinois 25, Yale 25, Iowa 23, Wisconsin 20, Michigan 18, Princeton 16, Pennsylvania 14, Northwestern 13, Ohio State 10.

The investigation was carried further by means of the inquiry: *What special departments in what graduate schools?* To this question 71 institutions made specific reply, some of the outstanding summaries of which are set forth in the accompanying table.

As a special effort to evaluate this particular approach to the reliance upon the graduate schools, the question was asked: *Are your present faculty members from these same graduate schools? From these departments?* The answers verified the belief that prompted the question, namely, that

DEPARTMENTS OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS NAMED FIVE TIMES OR MORE

Department	*Institutions*					
	Chicago	Columbia	Harvard	Johns Hopkins	Illinois	Wisconsin
Education	10	17	—	—	—	—
History	11	7	—	—	—	—
English	10	8	9	—	—	—
Social Science*	10	—	—	—	—	—
Ancient Languages	9	—	—	—	—	—
Modern Languages	9	7	—	—	—	—
Mathematics	6	—	—	—	—	—
Science**	6	—	—	—	—	—
Chemistry	—	—	—	5	5	5
Biology	5	—	—	—	—	—

* Does not include economics and sociology, etc., when such subjects are named separately.

** When the various sciences are listed separately, they are so tabulated and not included in "Science."

faculty members rather naturally seek recruits from their own universities and departments. A good majority answered in the affirmative as to the graduate schools and about half as many as to the departments.

It is not claimed by the writer that this is a "scientific" study. Incidentally, it is his belief that many so-called "scientific" studies in the educational field fall short of the expectations aroused by the claims made for them. In this particular study the method pursued was that of questionnaires or schedules. Any study with this technique alone falls far short of being scientific. This method was resorted to because in this preliminary study there seemed to be no other way possible.

The questions were addressed to executive and administrative officers who are absorbed in many phases of college administration, and many of whom have not been profes-

sionally trained for the interpretation of teaching methods or programs. In the nature of the case, these college officials in case of doubt would wish to give preferential treatment to their own institutions and their own teachers. This is not to say that our correspondents are not sincere and honest men, but it is to say that they are pressed on many sides with many duties and no doubt the answers to the questions were not given as detailed study in some cases as the serious objectives of the investigation might require.

Furthermore, in the absence of definite definitions and prescriptions it could not be claimed that there was universal or even general agreement as to the significance of the questions asked.

Again, there are in the replies numerous subjective judgments as well as occasional efforts at objective measurement. So long as both these types of measurement are involved in a single study the results could not be referred to as strictly scientific. Dewey has remarked that the enterprise in which we are engaged is "the most complex, intricate and subtle of human enterprises." It is perfectly evident that the teachers here reported upon as great teachers excelled in the *art* of teaching, not the *science* of teaching.

It is generally recognized that genetics is an exact science. Perhaps it is true that the outstanding development in science during the last twenty-five years has been the development of genetics. As East says in his *Heredity and Human Affairs,* "Genetics was born and christened because of Gregor Mendel, not because he was such an intellectual giant that he could analyze and codify the complex results which had baffled his predecessors in hybridization work, but because he had the really brilliant idea of simplifying his experiments to the point where he was dealing with only one or two variables at a time. When heretofore botanists had crossed plants differing by hundreds of characters and had been bewildered at the apparent chaos of their data, Mendel used varieties which differed by a single striking character. This lone character he followed through gen-

eration after generation with the care of a master workman, obtaining results so simple that he was able to give them their correct interpretation." As appears from the study here presented, there are in some cases twenty, thirty, even sixty different types of approved teaching characteristics and it will be many a day before the thorough scientific method of Gregor Mendel can be applied to the problems here discussed.

At the same time the replies which have been received from this group of college officials indicate—roughly, it may be, as is inevitable in a pioneer study—certain dominant tendencies both in their estimation of the qualities and traits of a great teacher and in their description of the administration's method of constructing a faculty. The report presented is a picture, if not accurately of the great teachers and of the methods of constructing faculties, at least of the mental processes of a more or less highly differentiated group of our educational workers. If it does not indicate the type of teacher they ought to have, it at least indicates the type of teacher they think they have and it indicates frankly the excellences as well as the deficiencies of their present methods of faculty building.

Summary of Conclusions

1. It appears that the so-called great teacher has been found throughout the entire history of our denominational colleges, but that contrary to the prophecies frequently made, more of them have appeared in the twentieth century than in the nineteenth century. The decade in which the largest number of great teachers was listed was the decade ending 1920.

2. It appears that the great teachers have taught the great subjects, the subjects which have always—or, at least, since the rise of science—taken the prominent place in the college curriculum, although there is evidence that the question after all is not a question of subjects but of teachers.

3. It appears that in the judgment of our correspondents it has not been the teachers who made their work easy or popular who have been considered the great teachers, but rather those who have inspired their students to greater individual effort.

4. It appears that a considerable majority of these teachers have not been trained in education, but along with this finding must be considered the fact that a good majority of the college officials are now giving preferential treatment to those who have had training in education.

5. The assumption that the teachers in these colleges have not been men of modern training does not stand as indicated by the findings of this study.

6. It appears that the attitude of these college officials is decidedly not one of antagonism to research. It would, of course, be hazardous to agree that everything reported as research would meet the requirements of a scientific definition, but it is not only interesting but illuminating to observe that a very large proportion of the colleges insist that their great teachers have had at least the research attitude of mind. At the same time there is a very decided opinion among them that the traits which lead to successful research are different from the traits which lead to successful teaching, and there is a very strong trend in the direction of giving first consideration in the employment of teachers in these colleges to the capacity to teach. It is claimed by our correspondents that the men who have been engaged in so-called research have been more distinguished for their fruitful contacts with students than for their publications.

7. These college executives do not believe that teachers have been listed as great because of their diffused interest in the problems of life in general. They report that a few of them have been essentially discursive in their thinking and methods, but that the overwhelming majority of them, while showing broad sympathies with life and with the institutions of life, have nevertheless held closely to the teaching of their subjects.

8. It also appears that very few of the great teachers are estimated purely on the basis of their pedagogical technique. With their skill in teaching have usually gone distinct characteristics of personality, character and definite religious influence.

9. The answers to the question as to whether they were distinguished scholars, undoubtedly need careful interpretation, and the data at present are insufficient for this interpretation.

10. There was a very general expression on the part of our correspondents that the teachers under consideration were noted for their success in stimulating students to frequent the libraries. The testimony on this point is almost universally favorable.

11. The consensus of opinion is very conclusive that these teachers stimulated their students to further study in the graduate schools and elsewhere.

12. The personal qualities or traits of the great teachers are, in order,—interest in the students, knowledge or mastery of the subject, sympathy, helpfulness, character and personality.

13. In the matter of building faculties, it appears that nearly all of these colleges profess to have some sort of a technique. More of them rely upon the graduate schools than upon any other agency of employment. This opens up a subject into which this study does not go. The writer believes that on this point the colleges did not do themselves justice. They made no reference to the methods by which the institutions are assisting in the development of professional study while in service. No reference was made to exchange professors or to the fact that large numbers of colleges subscribe regularly for professional periodicals for the use of members of their faculties. There are scores of colleges which take from ten to sixty copies of the Association of American Colleges BULLETIN for the use of their teachers.

It is surprising that so few colleges make any reference to their agencies of personnel, and that only one college

reports its effort to guide students in self-discovery. Evidently, in these institutions, personnel work has not been coördinated with their teaching processes.

14. There seems to be a strong sentiment that length of service of a faculty member is in itself a virtue, and there is little indication that the methods which are used in some of the great phases of big business, where a highly capable man is frequently shifted from one place to another in the service in order that he may be kept ever alert, are in use. It will be recalled that in not a few of our American colleges, great teachers have not taught the subject in which they specialized for their Ph. D. degree. William Rainey Harper was a conspicuous illustration and the names of numerous others will come to mind. A great business concern which employs engineers has recently been referred to which refuses to assign a man to an engineering job in the field in which he specialized. If he is an electrical engineer they give him a job in mechanical engineering; if he is a civil engineer they assign him a task in which electrical engineering plays an important part; they thereby try to keep their men everlastingly on their toes. The custom found in industry to "switch" the dependable men to new but kindred lines, to prevent them from getting into ruts or becoming too much localized is not reported here. There is no doubt but that long tenure for the sake of long tenure is destined soon to receive a searching challenge.

15. There is a growing disposition to recognize that *teaching* counts and to promote teachers on the basis of good teaching as the major consideration.

16. The facts are brought out very clearly as to what graduate schools are now making the greatest contribution of teachers to these colleges. Under this head the statement should be made that the Graduate School of Duke University alone, which is yet in the process of organization, reports a definite plan for the developing along professional lines of students who show aptitude or interest in the teaching profession. This may be prophetic of one of the next great steps of graduate education in this country.

WHO IS A GREAT TEACHER?

PRESIDENT GUY E. SNAVELY
Birmingham-Southern College

Better teaching! Better teaching is possible! Better teaching is frequently needed! Ever since I have been six years of age, I have spent all my time in the atmosphere of the classroom, as student or teacher, save for the two years of the World War. During these thirty-nine years I have met and worked with quite a number of teachers, both as pupil and colleague. My experience has thrown me, as a student, in contact with teachers in private and public schools, and in universities in this country and Europe. As teacher, I have had the privilege of working with teachers in military academies, church and independent colleges, and large universities.

Few, indeed, of this group of teachers can be truly considered great teachers. In meditating upon the reason for the fewness of great teachers, I have come to the conclusion that the distinguishing characteristic of the great teacher is the scarcity of that elusive and indefinable something we call personality.

Practically all of those with whom I have rubbed elbows in the teaching profession were equipped scholastically to be able to teach their chosen subjects. This qualification seems more easily obtained than some others most to be desired in the great teacher. Occasionally, however, I have found a man very scantily equipped for the subject he is teaching. Too frequently in the field of high-school teaching especially do we find a teacher, more frequently a young woman, willing to accept the position of teaching science when she has been trained to instruct in English and history, or *vice versa*. Home ties and other selfish reasons permit such a misfit. No real teacher, much less school administrator, will sanction such a procedure.

Next to competent scholarship, the second absolute requirement for a teacher is that of character. Unfortunately, there are many more teachers deficient in this particular than in the one above discussed. The teacher has a great responsibility in guiding and influencing for good or evil the tender minds of aspiring youth. Consciously or unconsciously, the teacher is influencing the pupil for better or worse. No pretense to standards in the classroom, which are not lived up to outside, should be permissible. The great teacher must be a man of the highest principles and force of character. In my humble judgment, to be such he will be an adherent of some church.

In addition to meeting the highest requirements of scholarship and character, the great teacher must have personality. Be he as wise as Solomon and as pious as Saint Paul, he can produce a dormant atmosphere in his classroom by his manner of speech and style of recitation unless he has personality.

The more I have thought about the question of personality, the more I find that it is impossible to define. Personality in one instructor may mean quite a different thing from personality in another. If an instructor should imitate slavishly the qualities of personality quite noticeable in a teacher recognized as a great personality, he might soon be taken as a joke and a failure. There must be certain native qualities that the great teacher himself will discover and develop.

I am bold enough to suggest, however, that there are some fundamental traits of personality that a great teacher will possess. He certainly would aim to have a pleasant voice and a cheerful disposition. He would be careful in his dress. He would have a friendly manner. He would show poise in emergencies. He would, above all, be possessed of a sense of humor.

The greatest part of my task as a college president is the finding of suitable teachers. Judging from experience, it is not as difficult to obtain endowment funds, buildings,

great numbers of students and many other things, including unjust and unnecessary criticism.

Other features of personality in the great teacher would certainly include initiative and imagination, concentration and adaptability. Above all, the great teacher should be able to get the other's point of view; not only be able to put himself in the position of his student, but be able to appreciate the feelings of his colleagues. He certainly should be able to work with his fellows and appreciate the need of cordial team work.

My good friend, Hamilton Holt, former editor of *The Independent,* and now president of Rollins College, stated at his recent inauguration that his special aim for Rollins College was the building up of a Faculty of Golden Personalities. He is seeking, of course, for the same thing that all successful college presidents have always desired. He has simply applied a new adjective which is most appropriate. He goes further, however, in promising to raise enough endowment to pay whatever salaries are necessary to attract the golden personalities that we others have already discovered. Some of us have already been doing what he proposes in his search for golden personalities, that is, taking the judgment of students in preference to colleagues. The latter, however, usually are soft-hearted and charitable enough to say the best of things about their friends, to enable them to have promotions.

To sum up, the great teacher must have *character, scholarship, and personality.* Without personality the teacher will not become great. Moreover, this personality must not only pervade the classroom but extend beyond its walls. The great teacher will not be satisfied to enter at the ringing of the bell and leave at the close of the hour without becoming intimately acquainted with his pupils. Probably the most important quality constituting personality is that of unselfishness.

Of the few great teachers who have assisted in molding my career, the most helpful was the grammar school prin-

cipal who taught me in the seventh and eighth grades. He went out of his way to take a personal interest in my work. He stimulated me to higher endeavor by encouraging words and helpful suggestions as to the reading of good books. In other words, I feel that he fired my ambition to higher aims.

The Great Teacher, who walked the Judean hills nineteen hundred years ago, drew His followers through His personality. His life of unselfish service and His method of teaching are still the best pattern for all of us desiring to become better teachers.

For whatever interest it may have, I submit the following statement furnished me by my faculty:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TEACHING QUALITIES
Birmingham-Southern College

Factors in Teaching

I. *The Individual Factor:*

- a. High code of ethics
- b. Sincerity
- c. Good example

} Integrity of Character

- d. Good breeding
- e. Neat appearance
- f. Mastery of language
- g. Poise (Absence of sarcasm)
- h. Cheerfulness
- i. Health (Care of)

} Culture

II. *The Subject Factor:*

- a. Thorough knowledge of special subject and related subjects
- b. Knowledge of methods of teaching his subject, grading, outside reading, exams, lectures, etc.
- c. Enthusiasm:
  1. Willingness to work
  2. Interest in subject
  3. Eagerness to convey
  4. Faith in value of subject
  5. Originality

III. *The Student Factor:*

a. Appreciation of students' viewpoint	Sympathy in Classroom
b. Readiness to help individuals	
c. Patience	
d. Fairness	
e. Interest in student activities	Sympathy outside of Classroom
f. Interest in life preparation	

FROM READERS OF THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE

I have just had the opportunity to look over your recent book, *The Effective College.* I think that this is one of the best books on the American college that have been written. I want to congratulate you on the contribution and on the form in which it is written. I feel that this is decidedly a real contribution to the problems of the American college.—*R. M. Hughes, President, Iowa State College.*

Please accept my best thanks for the copy of *The Effective College,* which makes an important contribution to the development of higher education in America. With some of the material I am already familiar and I am making the acquaintance of the rest as rapidly as possible. The Association has done us all a great service in organizing such a volume.—*Walter Morris Hart, Vice-President, University of California.*

My copy of *The Effective College* has just arrived and I think it is perfectly splendid. It certainly is a comprehensive volume and will be most useful.—*Harriet Newhall, Mount Holyoke College.*

I have just had an opportunity to read *The Effective College.* I wish to congratulate you and the other contributors upon this very interesting and helpful discussion of the problems of higher education.—*William S. Gray, Dean, The University of Chicago.*

Thank you sincerely for sending me a copy of *The Effective College.* A glance through the pages cannot fail to arouse the interest of one who has had something to do with higher education in the United States.—*George E. Vincent, President, The Rockefeller Foundation.*

THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE TEACHING AS AN ADMINISTRATIONAL PROBLEM

PRESIDENT REES EDGAR TULLOSS
Wittenberg College

In the last analysis, the quality of the teaching in our colleges depends upon the attitude of the administration. In a first analysis, failure to reach a higher level of teaching efficiency seems to be due to the inability or the indifference of the teachers; in a second analysis, it seems the fault of the graduate schools; in another analysis, it seems the fault of the trustees, who do not provide adequate salaries or equipment; in another analysis, it seems the fault of the deans, whose primary duty it is to administer academic matters; but in the last analysis, it *is* the fault of *the presidents.*

We presidents have so long been accustomed to think that the responsibility rests upon some one else, or something else, that it is perhaps presumptive to try to dent the shining surface of our presidential self-complacency.

My conviction is that the reason why we do not have better teaching in our several institutions lies in the fact that we presidents do not sufficiently desire better teaching; and my thesis is that if in the effort to bring about this highly desirable improvement in college teaching, we use the administrative power we possess, the quality of teaching will presently be appreciably improved.

In justification of this conviction, and in support of this thesis, I shall place before you some considerations with reference to (1) desiring good teachers, (2) detecting good teachers, (3) developing good teachers, (4) demanding good teachers, and, last of all (which is where it usually comes), (5) rewarding good teachers.

1. Desiring Good Teachers

A successful college president has stated as one of the features of his policy, formally adopted and publicly announced: "Every time a teacher is to be replaced, replace him with a better teacher." If we are genuinely sincere

in our desire for better teaching in our institutions, we may well place some such resolution over our lintels and bind it upon our foreheads (which is ancient Hebrew for putting it upon the tablets of our hearts). There is great need that we recognize this problem as a basic problem, that we recognize it as our problem, and that we accept the duty of solving it as *our basic obligation.*

We seem to make progress in almost every other direction. We acquire buildings and endowments. We secure students. We get publicity. We achieve accrediting. Why are we not more successful in securing better teaching? Is this the one matter in which we are powerless? Te one end for the attainment of which we have no machinery at our command? Are no achievements here possible? Is there nothing to do but to wait and to hope? Or, is it true that what we desire, we get. If we do not have superior teaching, is it because we have not sufficiently *desired* it?

There may be differences of opinion as to which one of two matters should be our chief concern. One high duty of the president of a college of our type is to have a care for the spiritual and moral welfare of his charges. Another high duty is that of securing for them the finest teaching service that by the use of money, discrimination, salesmanship, example and official pressure or reward, he can possibly secure. Certainly the latter item should stand not lower than in second place.

Moreover the two are closely related. The former is hardly possible without the latter. The character of the teaching in an institution has a profound effect upon the general morale of that institution. The morale of the faculty as a whole is favorably affected by high grade instruction at any point, adversely affected by instruction that is poor. The morale of the student body is heightened by the work of each good teacher; lowered by the inadequate service of each poor teacher.* This involves not only the

* Cf. *Undergraduates,* edited by Galen S. Fisher, page 310. To a proper estimate of this interesting summary of student opinion we may be helped by Mr. Evans' review in the Association of American Colleges BULLETIN, December, 1928.

attitude of the student toward things intellectual; it affects his general attitude. It is held by some that it affects even his moral attitude. The student who is stimulated, kept at work, keyed to the proper pitch in the class room, is less apt to sag morally outside the class room.

Given a chance to choose between a new building that will streak like a comet across the consciousness of our clientele, and an added endowment that can quietly be used to improve our service to the students, which should we choose? Given a friend who is already "sold" on a building gift, have we the courage and skill to convince him of the greater need, and to "sell" him the opportunity to help us improve our teaching staff? Buildings and equipment are inconsequential save as they are the workshops and tools of teachers with spirit, insight and artistry. We know this, of course; but do we accept its implications? Do we put it into our practice?

Our trustees are not always helpful. The tendency is for them to be interested in the plant, in the investment of funds, in accounting procedure. They seem to think that they are trustees of the property only. What needs to be done is to make them realize that they are trustees of the welfare of the students. Moreover, from the standpoint of material resources only, what will contribute more largely, in the long run, to the solution of our financial problems than high grade instruction? What better basis for our plea for enlarged support than distinctively superior service? Upon whom can we depend more surely in the years ahead for endowment gifts, for added buildings, than upon alumni who in college have been disciplined for future successes, whose memories turn with respect and gratitude to those teachers who led, guided, challenged and inspired them in college days?

The development of a dominating desire for better teaching is the first important step toward securing it. There will follow earnest thought with reference to

2. Detecting Good Teachers

The difficulties here are apparent.

What is good teaching? Who is a good teacher? By what standards shall teaching efficiency be measured? Are there not many types of teachers, and of teaching? May all subjects be taught in the same manner? Is there any way in which the real product of teaching can be estimated, evaluated? As to the efficiency of teaching, is it due to technique or to personality? Are Oscar Wilde's words applicable here as well as in the field of art—"Technique is really personality; that is why the artist can not teach it, why the pupil can not learn it, why the aesthetic critic can not understand it?"*

I recognize these difficulties and many others. I do not propose that we attempt too fine a discrimination. My immediate point is that we have not yet begun to act upon the knowledge which we already have or can secure. Who in our faculties without question are good teachers, and who without question are poor, we all know fairly well. Where judgment is uncertain or information is unattainable, let action wait on further knowledge. Where there is no question, let action be direct and positive.

The literature in the field of the measurement (perhaps better, estimation) of college teaching ability, though admittedly limited as yet, is growing. The field is alluring, and entrance into it has here and there been made. Within a few years the literature will probably be voluminous. For a brief, simple, and comprehensive statement of the qualifications of a good teacher, I know of nothing more suggestive than the list of characteristics used in the Oberlin scale for the rating of teachers.**

* Oscar Wilde, *The Critic as Artist.*

** These characteristics are briefly summarized as:

1. Breadth and richness of his courses in respect to content.
2. Organization of his courses (efficiency in the planning and in the general conduct of his courses).
3. Clearness in explanation and in illustration.
4. Getting the student's point of view.
5. Skill in eliciting and directing discussion.

Certainly we shall not make the mistake of thinking that the instructional methods required in college must be the same as those found useful in the elementary or secondary schools. We know our special needs. To quote Dr. Kelly: "The best teacher is the one who does not 'teach,' if the concept is to be carried over from the lower schools, but the one who kindles the inner fires."* It is quite possible that "what may be needed is a complete breaking away from tradition, and the devising of instructional methods suited to the demands of modern higher education."**

In connection with this matter of the detection of good teachers, there naturally arises the problem of our attitude toward research on the part of our faculty members. The relation of research to teaching is not a question of an evil over against a good. Except where financial stringency makes it so, it is not even a matter of placing one value over against another. A more discriminating inquiry recognizes both values, and directs itself toward the problem of the wisest investment of the funds we have available for the purchase of instructional and research services.

It is possible that now and then we may discover that rare man who possesses research ability of a high order, and who is at the same time a sound and inspiring teacher. If we have or can secure one or two of these, let us prize them as precious pearls among our faculty jewels. Let us not expect to have many. There are too few of them in existence for any of us to think we can follow the advertiser's suggestion to "add a pearl a year." Before a sound answer can be given to the question as to the ad-

6. Care in assignment of papers or other collateral work, and adequacy of consideration of the same.
7. Accessibility for consultation.
8. Interest in students as individuals.
9. Stimulating the student to his highest level of achievement.
10. General influence on student morale.

* Association of American Colleges BULLETIN, Nov. 1928, p. 360.

** *Ibid.*, M. E. Haggerty, p. 391.

visability of employing instructors who are primarily research men, and only secondarily teachers, an analysis of the situation must be made.

Three distinct values of research may be noted: (1) it may serve the cause of the advancement of knowledge; (2) it may serve the cause of better teaching; (3) it may serve the cause of institutional prestige.

The purchase of prestige by maintaining upon our faculties high-priced research men and scholarly writers is entirely legitimate. It is praiseworthy. It is not uncommon. But when it is adopted as a policy at the cost of inefficient instruction, it is hardly less than criminal.

In the advancement of knowledge, the importance of research is beyond dispute. But the question arises, How largely is this a function of colleges of our type? Dr. Kelly is doubtless correct in his assertion: "The average college is not created primarily for the extension of knowledge. It is the function of universities to make this special contribution." Most of us would deplore the exclusive allotment of this high privilege to the university. As a participant in the educational work of the world, the college desires a modest share here also. In the main, however, research in the smaller college must be supplemental, aside from the main aim; therefore, a luxury. Would it be fair to suggest that it be paid for only when we are sure that we can afford the luxury? If we have the money to spend for research, let us do so frankly. Let us secure as many strong research specialists as we can conscientiously pay for—no more! Then let us set them largely free, in rare cases entirely free, from teaching duties.

From the standpoint of benefit to students, the work of such a research professor will not be without result. He will stimulate his fellow teachers to more devoted personal study. He will help to create an atmosphere of devotion to the cause of advancing knowledge. And in the cases of a few rare students drawn into close association with him in his pursuit of truth, he may render a specific service,

the result of which may be the awakening of genius. In our student bodies there are many Tom Smiths; perhaps, here or there, an Arthur Compton. If student participation is really to be developed, we dare not deprive the student of that contagion of interest which spreads from the keenly alert teacher imbued with the research spirit. A "fresh spring" is better than a "stagnant pool," no matter how much stir and splatter may be created in the latter by the fuss and fury of a technician.

With a gradually clarifying view of what good teaching is, we shall concern ourselves directly with the problem of

3. Developing Good Teachers

In proportion to the teachers we already have, we add only a few a year. An important phase of our problem is the developing of the teachers already on our lists. Some of them are good teachers now; some have possibilities of development. Our administrative responsibility certainly covers the duty of furthering this development.

A part of our task consists in arousing our teachers to a realization of the fact that improvement needs to be made. Many of them already know this; in some cases they may know it better than the administration. In a part of the teaching staff, however, we must develop a better attitude; we must lead certain members of the faculty to realize the possibility, the desirability, the necessity of improving teaching methods.

Entirely aside from those practical ways in which an administrator may seek to change this attitude of disregard for method, some of which ways are to be mentioned later, it seems necessary for us to aid in overcoming an all-too-common attitude of indifference, superiority, or suspicion with reference to the technique proposed by specialists in education. If the president himself has had specific training along this line, there are those who will sneer: "Educational theory showing itself again!" If he has not been so trained, some will exclaim: "Behold the influence of the

department of education." To meet this situation we shall need to show both resolution and tact. Our administrative help is sorely needed in developing a friendlier attitude toward the technical study of educational methods, and in bringing about a willingness to believe that the departments of education can really offer helpful cooperation. In the securing of a body of factual knowledge, and in making progress toward securing that improvement in teaching which we seek, we must bring about cooperation between the department of education and other departments in our institutions. To depend for the development of this cooperative spirit upon any influence less than that of the president will be to postpone the day when all the forces at our command will be directed toward this, the common problem.

To turn to the practical question of the forms of administrative helpfulness in this task of aiding in the development of better teachers, we ask: What can the president do? What personal contribution should he be making to the solution of the problem?

One president changes the conventional character of the faculty meetings. Routine business is handled by an executive committee. When the faculty gathers, it is for the purpose of deliberate study of just this problem of better teaching. Another ventures a questionnaire among his students and among the faculty members themselves. A third seeks from alumni, through a carefully prepared questionnaire, their judgment as to which of the professors they found to be good teachers and which not good, reasons to be given in every instance. In both cases the data gathered by these questionnaires are studied by the faculty as a whole.

Another president sends each teacher one week of each year to a school of unquestioned standing to study the methods of teaching in his own field. "Stimulating and helpful" he reports the practice to be. At one institution there is deliberate encouragement of inter-class-room visitation, particular stress being laid upon the desirability of

frequent calls upon the abler teachers on the part of the younger men. In other colleges, departmental responsibility is strongly emphasized. The head of each department, or some one directly appointed by him, assumes responsibility for informal conferences in which discussions, studies, and even demonstrations tend to make clear the better teaching methods in the field of the department.

At some institutions administrative encouragement is being heartily given to a study of the newer methods in education of college grade. Experimentation in the use of some of these new methods, even the more revolutionary types, is here and there being encouraged. One faculty proposes that in four or five classes each year, careful experimentation be carried on, the results to be watched by the entire faculty. Teachers for these special classes are to be carefully chosen; the procedure thoroughly planned. President and faculty will share interest in the outcome.*

* A bulletin describing one such experiment, in which features of the Dalton and Winnetka methods are being adapted to the college level, is presently to be issued by Wittenberg College.

Section headings in a recent report of a survey of teaching methods provide stimulating suggestions: *The Present Status of Attempts at Improvement of Instruction in Land-Grant Colleges*, A Survey by Charles D. Bohannan. The study covers the following topics:

1. Supervision of instruction of new faculty members.
2. Use of faculty committees or discussion groups.
3. Use of "outside" lecturers or experts in teaching.
4. Encouragement given to faculty members to take courses in education.
5. Special courses for faculty members.
6. Research on problems of college instruction.
7. The study of the teaching procedure used by admittedly or reputedly successful college instructors.
8. The study of technique and procedures for distinguishing between efficient and inefficient teachers, on some other basis than opinion or reputation.
9. Comparative studies, under controlled conditions, of various methods of conducting college classes, *e.g.*, comparison of the lecture method and the problem method, slow versus rapid sections, the use of class period of varying lengths, including the supervised or directed study plan, etc.

Other lines along which our effort may be directed are the following, in all of which the leadership and guidance of the president may find a place:

1. Encouragement of summer study, with special effort to secure enrolment in at least one course in the technique of teaching.
2. Encouragement of attendance at scientific and educational gatherings.
3. Encouragement of research on the part of good teachers, by administrative approval, by lightening the teaching load, by provision of special equipment, by grants-in-aid, etc.
4. Adoption of some form of sabbatical leave, with emphasis upon use of time in directions which will contribute directly to the teaching program.
5. Encouragement of faculty reading on the subject of teaching technique; a special faculty committee to purchase for the college library books dealing with this matter, and to induce faculty study of them.
6. Encouragement of the practice of summer teaching at other institutions, in view of the stimulating effect of new contacts.
7. Encouragement of faculty use of blanks for student-rating of teachers, and for self-rating.
8. The selection, encouragement and hearty support of a dean, himself known as a good teacher, who is keenly alert to the problems involved and continuously active in those fields of cooperative leadership which are peculiarly open to him as dean.
9. Encouragement of teacher-student conferences, with the objective of discovering what the students are actually getting from courses, special student difficulties, etc.
10. Invitations to teachers of known ability in other institutions for special lectures and conferences on teaching methods.
11. Appointment of special advisers for younger instructors, on a friendly "elder brother" basis, for the special purpose of help in developing teaching technique.
12. Distribution among faculty members of special bulletins and pamphlets dealing with the subject of better teaching.
13. Addresses on the part of the president, and incidental comment, conveying clearly to faculty members his deep concern in the matter of the quality of teaching.*

* There can be no question as to the value of frequent contact between the president and the teachers, and a sympathetic sharing of views, problems, and mutual hopes, with reference to instructional service to students. A friendly expression of interest and a word of encouragement will pave the way for the kindly reception of a helpful suggestion.

14. Enthusiastic administrative recognition of student attainments in scholarship as well as in athletics, debating, etc., thus showing the president's interest in the results of good teaching.

A danger in this whole procedure must not be overlooked —the danger that by emphasizing teaching technique, we encourage still further the purely utilitarian tendency of modern education, so that the ideal of "imparting knowledge rather than promoting human welfare" becomes still more general. The preventive here is the emphasis upon the personality of the teacher. We shall do well to remember the truth, so well phrased by Canon Ravan, that "life is not ours in order that we may become experts. We become experts in order that life may be enriched."*

In spite of all that we do or can do, some of our teachers will show less improvement than we hoped for. When, however, we come to the choice of new members of the instructional staff, we stand unhindered and unhampered (save by the limits of the salaries we can pay) before a door of opportunity. We shall enter it only as we move definitely and unswervingly toward the position of

4. Demanding Good Teachers

The considerations that govern a wise choice of new members of the staff bear also upon the matter of the retention or dismissal of present teachers. On this latter question we shall later have a word to say.

A real problem, with many ramifications, is the "Ph.D. problem." We all know well enough the kind of teaching that is prevalent in certain schools where the policy is to employ "good teachers" without concern as to the amount of graduate training these so called "good teachers" have had. We know the instructional superficiality and the administrative subterfuge that are involved. With such a policy no wise administration will have sympathy.

We also know well enough the kind of teaching which is prevalent in schools where by reason of the pressure of

* *Princeton Alumni Weekly.*

accrediting agencies or a foolishly directed desire for faculty-degree-prestige, the policy is to make the Ph.D. degree an essential qualification, with teaching skill an incident, an accident, one of the *adiaphora*. Such a policy is tolerated by too many presidents; some have for it a secret and illegitimate affection.

I shall not reiterate the common strictures upon undue emphasis upon the Ph.D. The practice of seeking Ph.D.'s changes from fashion, folly, and futility to sound administrative policy solely in proportion as the person who chooses teachers thinks first of teaching skill and second of possession of a degree; as he does his utmost to secure both; and as he is ready to choose a man for his ability as a teacher rather than for his success in attaining degrees.

The proposal of a degree other than the Ph.D., as recognition not only for knowledge of a field, but also for knowledge of the technique of teaching in that field, will probably not be found acceptable. However, the suggestion is not without merit. If the Ph.D. is to be granted only in accord with the dictum of the American Association of University Professors, there can be no question as to the need for a new degree. "The doctor's degree should be conferred only upon persons of unusual intellectual endowment, with unequivocal capacities for research." Why not a degree to be conferred upon persons of unusual intellectual endowment, possessing thorough acquaintance with a particular field, and with *unquestionable capacity for effective and inspiring teaching?*

I have not seen a better or briefer statement of this possibility than the following from a recent number of *Antioch Notes:*

> Important as it is, research should not be made the sole measure of educational merit. Our graduate schools are clogged with men and women plodding into middle life at perfunctory theses who can never contribute anything original, but who might have developed genuine skill in other endeavors.
>
> Do we not need new educational criteria and programs for those who have capacity to learn and perhaps the genius to teach, but not

to create? Some new degree or other recognition could give them their due, while distinguishing their work from that creative effort which should bear the name of research.*

For the man who has won the degree under the present requirements, I have, for more than one reason, profound respect. I respect him for his knowledge, even though it be knowledge in a field more and more carefully restricted and limited. Most of all, I respect him for the moral purpose which he has shown in undergoing what he had to undergo in order to win the degree. In considering any suggested substitute degree we may well take thought as to the possible loss of something here which has real value.

As the matter now stands, the possession of the Ph.D. conveys no assurance of the possession of teaching ability. Give us, for our colleges, Ph.D.'s—worthy and stiffly trained Ph.D.'s who know thoroughly their fields—but give us Ph.D.'s who have had definite and resultful training in the technique of the teacher's art—who have had practice-teaching of college grade under supervision—teachers certified to us as being able to teach. There is nothing unreasonable in such a demand. It is for their teaching work that we employ them. How utterly preposterous it is to be told that we do not know what we want, or that if we do, we do not want what is best for us, when we venture to request what we know is vitally needed at the institutions whose needs we know if we know anything at all.

If it is true that at least 75 per cent of those persons who receive the Ph.D. become teachers (at some institutions the percentage runs much higher); and if it is true, on the other hand, that not a single school** in America requires of those intending to teach, a course in the technique of college instruction as a prerequisite to the Ph.D.; and if it is true that 85 per cent of all the courses in that field are

* *Antioch Notes*, November 15, 1928.

** At the Chattanooga convention, attention was called to the procedure now being worked out in the Graduate School of Duke University, intended to provide this technical training.

to be found within six of our universities,—so anomalous a situation cries aloud for a changed procedure.

Dean Haggerty's comment is discriminating and pertinent:

> It may fairly be asked whether the time has not arrived to face squarely the obvious facts. The graduate schools of American universities are essentially teacher-training institutions, and upon the kind of training which they offer and require of their doctorate candidates will depend the character of our college faculties and the quality of college education. Is it too much to ask that in this program of graduate training the student should be required to give some attention to the problems of education—problems which will constitute the student's chief concern once he is launched on his professional career?*

When this Association's Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers tabulated the responses to its preliminary questionnaire, it found that, with one exception, the most strikingly unanimous vote was recorded in answer to this question:

> Do you think it necessary or desirable for Graduate Departments or Schools to provide special courses of training for the benefit of those who are planning to teach in college?

To this question 254 institutions replied "Yes"; 17 "No." If that does not show a "felt need," I do not know what would. What we now need to do is to transform this "felt need" into a "felt demand"—a demand felt where it ought to be felt, that is on the part of administrations of the graduate schools. Up to the present time these administrations have shown themselves to be fairly well anaesthetized. But there is one point at which the graduate school organism is not anaesthetized, and will not be. That is the Placement Bureau. It seems, therefore, that we should do well to concentrate our stimuli at that point. I do not propose the stimulus of argument, but rather that of direct and concerted action. There may be a pertinent suggestion in the fact that we hear the clock tick only when it stops ticking.

* *Educational Record*, November, 1928.

Is there no fundamental law to which we may turn in this matter of securing better teachers? I think there is. I refer to the most important law of the economic world—the law that affects practically every phase of our existence, and conditions every form of our activity—the law of supply and demand. Its mighty power, directed upon the situation which we now deplore, would remedy that situation within a decade.

There are many ways in which we can improve the situation with which we are now concerned. But all together, they will result in little compared with what will result if we actually attack this problem with the means fully and solely within our power, and demand from those who are to be placed in our class rooms teaching skill as an absolutely necessary qualification.

The time seems peculiarly ripe for action. For ten years we have been facing the difficulties of what is known in the commercial world as a "seller's market." The production of well-trained college teachers has been unequal to the consumption. To meet an unprecedented increase in enrolment we have had to provide an unprecedented enlargement of our faculties. Since 1918 we have added more teachers than we then had. For the next ten years there is no prospect of a similar expansion. The years 1928 to 1938 will be marked by no such increasing demand. The pendulum starts now to swing in the opposite direction. We are to be favored by the conditions which create a "buyer's market." The spirit in which we shall demand good teachers will of course be kindly and considerate. We shall not forget that if any enterprise in the world is in its very essence a cooperative undertaking, it is the educational enterprise.

We come finally to the consideration of that matter which we have here placed last, but which must be in fact far from last, viz., that of

5. Rewarding Good Teachers

To all that has been said there is an important corollary. The rule of proper reward for efficient service must be regarded.

To whom are due the rewards in rank and salary? Our practice has been to reward degrees, and age, and years of experience, and length of service in our own schools, and sometimes mere ranking. Why not reward what ought to be rewarded—skill in the doing of the real work of the teacher?*

Our teachers as a class are as free from the mercenary motive as any group in the world, unless it be the preachers. Dean McConn estimates them truly:

> The great majority are men of superior parts. The abler ones among them are fully the peers of the leaders in business and the professions. . . . Many of them are prodigious workers. And especially are they distinguished by an unworldly disinterestedness. In a country and a period in which a majority of the population have concentrated exclusively on acquisition and pleasure, this group—almost alone—is devoting itself to the higher life, to the things of the mind, to the advancement of knowledge and the training of youth; accepting for the privilege of doing so, a compensation which amounts to little more than maintenance.**

That most teachers are motivated by deep-seated love for their work, is beyond question. Professor Palmer manifested the spirit of the teaching profession when he declared: "Harvard University pays me for doing what I would gladly pay Harvard for the privilege of letting me do."

The very meagerness of the teacher's stipend, however, makes strong what his own inclination would lead him to disregard, the incentive of the possibility of increased earnings. Hold that reward clearly before the teacher who seeks to be a good teacher, bestow it upon him as liberally

* "We have agreed that a man who specializes on teaching shall not suffer as compared with a research man." From a description of the Freshman Year Plan at Yale.

** Max McConn, *College or Kindergarten*, p. 218.

(yes, even more liberally for a time, until the situation is balanced again) as upon those who do research work and write. We shall thereby alter the attitude of our teachers as we can do it by no possible amount of statistical study, philosophical argument, or impassioned exhortation.

As a preliminary to any resultful adoption of this procedure there must be escape from the lock-step policy of promotion which has grown up among us or been forced upon us, and which acts as a barrier to progress and a fetter upon freedom of reward. "Equal degrees, plus equal teaching-experience, plus equal ranking, must mean equal salaries." How fallacious a theory! How pernicious a policy! We may continue to be hampered in our bestowal of the reward of higher ranking. We cannot have faculties made up completely of full professors. There is no sound reason why we should be hampered, within the limits of a flexible salary scale, in bestowing the reward of increased salary.

A concomitant of the duty to reward the good teacher must be mentioned. The poor teacher must be aided to improve, or must be dispensed with. In some cases no procedure but the latter will suffice. If it was ever expedient that one man should die for the people, it may be asked whether a few persons who are teachers in name only should not starve for the pupils. Over against the misery of the man who is asked to resign, it may be fair to place the damage done to the scores who are disappointed, aggrieved , and in many cases irretrievably damaged, by his instructional malpractice.

In what I have said I have simply tried to point out what I regard as my personal duty and yours, from the practical administrative standpoint; and to suggest that in the performance of this duty there is an opportunity second to few that are before us as presidents today.

THE PRODUCTION OF GOOD COLLEGE TEACHING

DIRECTOR CHARLES H. JUDD
School of Education, University of Chicago

It has become the fashion of late to classify lecturing to college classes as one of the cardinal sins. Figures of speech, such as "pouring in process," have been resorted to in the effort to find words strong enough to express adequately the condemnation of lecturing which critics feel. Harrowing reminiscences are recounted of the suffering endured in undergraduate days when the precious time and intellectual energy of whole college classes were wasted by some incompetent, mumbling professor who read antiquated notes hour after hour. New and supposedly better methods of college teaching are suggested. The professor is to sit at his desk and the student who has become conscious of a problem is to seek the professor's aid in solving the problem. Or the student is to watch the professor as he skilfully writes some epoch-making treatise and becoming fired with enthusiasm, is to imitate the mature "fellow-worker."

There is another source of irritation to the critics of the college. Apparently some college teachers have been misled into that forbidden path known as research. The evils which result from research are said to be without number. The devotee becomes hollow-eyed and absent minded; he does not know the family histories of his students; he does not recognize an alumnus of the college at commencement time; he does not attend football practice. It is a question whether he gives proper attention to the duties of family life. He becomes so absorbed in strictly intellectual pursuits that he neglects everything else. Evidently the only place for him is a graduate school where he will not disturb the vivid and colorful life of the college.

Perhaps I have pointed out the dangers of lecturing and research in terms which the critics will characterize as lamentably lacking in vigor. I am frank to admit that I have difficulty in adjusting my thinking to most of what has been said on these topics. As a student of the science of education, I have been trained to look for evidence before I accept or reject any assertions about educational practices. Evidence about the efficiency of lecturing and about the effects of research on teaching is almost wholly wanting. There is an abundant literature on the American college, but it is a literature of the essay type, full of pleasing phrases and witty epigrams. It is not a scientific literature. The time has past in the field of elementary education when anyone dares to make an assertion about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a method of teaching without supporting his assertion with tangible measurements of results. It is less than a generation since the lower schools were hiding behind the false statement that educational results are so intangible that no one can be sure that he is right. If colleges are backward in their methods today, it is not because professors lecture or because professors have research interests, it is because colleges have not adopted scientific methods of directing their activities.

It is easily possible to determine whether lecturing is a successful or unsuccessful method of college teaching. Anyone who really wants to know the truth on this matter, can secure it with a relatively small expenditure of time and money. Some day college boards of trustees will be led by intelligent college presidents to set aside each year a modest sum for purposes of self-examination of the college. The records which now lie unused in the recorder's office will be compiled in such a way as to reveal which instructor stimulates students to elect courses in the lines of that instructor's speciality. A part of this modest sum will then be devoted to finding out how the successful stimulators of students do their work in the classroom and how these successful stimulators of students secure the material

which they employ in arousing the interest of students. Another part of the modest sum spent in self-examination will be devoted to discovering with precision the classes in which low-grade students congregate and the classes which attract the bright and industrious students. When this happens, the offhand condemnation of lecturing and research will give place to intelligent, discriminating evaluation.

When facts are substituted for speculation and hasty generalization, it will be noted that it is absurd to speak of lecturing as though it were a uniform procedure in the various classrooms where it is employed. There is a type of lecturing which is quite casual and unprepared. Those college teachers who adopt the casual and unprepared attitude toward their work have to be real geniuses to succeed. There is a type of lecturing which is the result of such meticulous refinement of phrases and ideas that it is repellant to some minds. The academic world has become the harbor of not a few sensitive souls who are by nature and habit so devoted to refinement that they are not adapted to give instruction to the football squad. Anyone who uses the word "lecturing" without discrimination to cover all forms of oral presentation of facts and fancies is, to say the least, over-hasty in generalization.

If there is need of care in the use of the word "lecturing," there is even more need of intelligence in the use of the word "research." There is research which consists in performing the act of accumulating certain items of knowledge. There is research which consists in the practice of the methods and art of intellectual inquiry. There is an ancient dispute in education. On the one side of this dispute are arrayed those who say that all knowledge is specific and particular. On the other side are those who believe that the human mind can develop ways of operating that will carry it into new fields of discovery. The second group of thinkers regard research as training in scholarly methods. To these the mere uncovering of a fact is trivial unless it reveals to the mind of the student a universal method of penetrating the unknown.

It is one of the misfortunes of our present-day civilization that the demands for education have far outrun the supply of competent educators. The rush of students into high schools and colleges has created an acute situation which we have not been able to meet. The present generation is frankly not prepared to furnish first-class intellectual leadership to the students in the next generation who are seeking instruction. The graduate schools are blamed for turning out immature and incompetent teachers. The answer which the graduate schools can properly make to this charge is that the educational institutions of the country are employing graduate students, with degrees lower than the highest at such a rate that it is impossible to keep students in training long enough to guarantee good equipment in intellectual methods. When college executives find in their faculties people of low intellectual achievements whom should they hold responsible, the graduate schools or their own administrative machinery which went into the open market and brought in an undesirable commodity?

Some light on this dispute about the effectiveness of lecturing and the value of research can perhaps be gained by referring to the history of the importation of these two disturbing factors into American education. As everyone knows, we imported both from German universities. In those institutions where lecturing and research were at home, conditions are totally different from the conditions in America. Germany is small enough so that students migrate freely from university to university. Good lecturers and competent leaders in methods of thinking are selected as a result of student migration by that very intelligent body of critics of teaching—the students. Furthermore, the German universities have a method of responding very sensitively to student judgment. In those institutions the professors are paid according to the number of students that they attract. In our own country conditions are so different from those in Germany that it is little wonder that the importation of German methods has caused some dis-

turbance. Our college students are immature. They migrate with difficulty and in opposition to the most energetic efforts on the part of colleges to prevent migration. Intercommunication between colleges, even intercommunication between departments in a single institution, is prevented so far as possible. The institution collects all fees and disburses as little as possible to the successful teacher—usually insisting on a fixed scale which ignores gradations of competency.

When lecturing and research were transferred from the open competition of the German university to the closed shop of the American college, they naturally began to function badly. The closed shop must of necessity ask every worker to fit into a schedule of hours which is based on average performance. Also, it prescribes that the units of raw materials handled be standardized. The units of student organization called "classes" must be equalized and must be as small as possible so as to prevent the rise of any individual operator above the general level of mediocrity. The failures in American teaching which have been charged to lecturing and research are in reality failures of a type of college organization which had no right to import methods of instruction unless it was prepared for radical changes throughout its whole anatomy.

I have chosen to formulate my discussion up to this point around the concrete problems of the lecture and research, not because I am interested in these particular problems alone, but because they make it possible to illustrate the thesis which I am here to defend. That thesis is that the best college teacher is the one who has learned to adapt his methods to the students and the institution which he serves and to the body of knowledge which he is to help develop. There is a briefer way of saying what I have just said. The best teacher is the teacher who consciously adjusts himself to his work. The reason why it is essential that we formulate this thesis with care is that American colleges have steadfastly held to the mythological faith that good

teachers are the products of chance. I should like to be as emphatic as I can in the assertion that good teachers are always and invariably products of conscious effort. They are made, not born. The fact that the making of good teachers has been up to date a private enterprise, that good teachers have made themselves, has blinded us to the necessity of carrying on the manufacturing operation. The time has come when institutions must take a hand in the production of teachers. If there is a good kind of lecturing, why not cultivate it on a large scale? If there are bad lecturers, why not set in motion institutional machinery for eliminating them? If enthusiasm for research is inimical to present institutional organization, why not find out which is wrong, the lust for research or the college organization?

Perhaps there are some in this company who are offended by the statement that good teaching can be manufactured? Let us consider some of the methods which can be recommended. A group of young instructors in a given institution come together periodically and exchange views with regard to their difficulties. One says that he has in his class an aggressive student who persists in asking trivial questions. Another says that he does not know how to gauge the amount of outside work which it is legitimate to ask the members of his class to do. Another finds that he is overburdened with the correction of written papers which he feels it necessary to require in order to keep up standards in his class. When these difficulties are presented, the group pools its experiences or seeks the advice of an older member of the staff and finally makes available to the whole group what might otherwise have remained a purely individual method of adjustment.

The reasons why there are not groups of instructors of this type in every college are that custom has not suggested this type of organization, the administration has been either through oversight or necessity too economical to provide leadership and consequently there has grown up a kind of

pride of isolation and self-sufficiency. College teachers have come to feel that any admission of fallibility is likely to discredit the whole profession. As a result, the tradition is universally accepted that all college teachers are in their own classrooms absolutely competent and above reproach. This tradition is known in wide circles to be indefensible, but it seems necessary to defend it except in the most intimate and confidential circles.

This unwholesome individualism of college teaching has operated to an extent that we seldom realize to defeat the expression of a legitimate individualism which would be highly advantageous. Our colleges are schedule-ridden. The college teacher who does nothing but teach classes in repetitious subjects demands that his hours be on the same schedule as that which defines the duties of the most competent lecturer and contributor to knowledge. Is it any wonder that in sheer desperation some research worker neglects his teaching? Is it any wonder, under these stereotyped institutional forms, that stereotyped despair settles down over minds which once had the promise of intellectual productivity?

One of my friends who is limited in his privileges of advocating educational reform by the responsible administrative position which he holds at the head of a great institution, uses a phrase in private conversation which I can repeat because it will not cause a commotion in any faculty. He says that a member of a faculty ought to be paid as other modern laborers are for piece-work. Salaries should be graded to correspond to the number of students who really pass at the end of the quarter and by the number of contributions to thinking as judged by one's peers, which are produced from time to time. Piece-work pay of this kind would drive some people out of the profession exactly as piece-work pay sends a number of lawyers each year into whatever is the retreat of those who have tried and failed in that profession.

Piece-work pay would stimulate individual initiative and inventiveness. There would be very little platitudinous

writing in essays on college about "the lecture method" because there would be no possibility of lumping together individual excellencies and deficiencies under a single word. Research would no longer be the purely formal operation which it sometimes is. Society would discover that intellectual inventiveness is worth much and that routine imitation is a commodity of less value.

I have as great a desire as my friend the administrator to secure good teaching for the college by stimulating the individual. I doubt whether piece-work pay is the best method of insuring good teaching. Furthermore, piece-work pay seems to me to throw on the individual the whole responsibility for devising good ways of teaching. Will it not be better for the colleges to share with the members of the faculty responsibility for stimulating those who enter the teaching staff? Will it not be well to discover by experimentation and testing what are the most effective methods and to transmit by training that which institutions find to be advantageous? The fact is that the public is beginning to demand of the college that it guarantee more uniformly good teaching than it has provided in the past. The college cannot escape institutional responsibility in a world where scientific evaluation of results is the watchword.

Perhaps I have not made the contribution which was to be expected under the subject assigned to me on the program. I have indulged in only a few comments on what constitutes the good teacher. I have, frankly, very little interest in defining the personal traits of any individual except as such a definition will bring into prominence the possibility of institutional production on a large scale of the highest types of virtue. I have tried to lift the discussion from the individual and to carry it over to the institution. Good teaching is, according to the view which I have tried to express, a collective product. Good teaching is a direct responsibility of the college administration. Good teaching is something which has to be paid for. The pay can be arranged at the end or at the beginning. If it is

paid for at the end only, the fee system is the only fair system. Far more advantageous for society is a system that contributes generously to good teaching in the beginning. Good teaching can be made. It can be institutionally contrived. It should be institutionally demanded, but before it is institutionally demanded, it should be institutionally cultivated. Society asks of the college that it provide good teaching. The college cannot shift responsibility to the faculty or to irresponsible critics who make pronouncements without discrimination.

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE

The following extracts are taken from a review of THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors, November, 1928:

The papers in THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE vary greatly in both substance and form: "Some were carefully prepared papers, others stenographic reports of *extempore* addresses before the annual meeting of the Association." But the volume as a whole may justly be said to represent the best thought about college problems that is being done in our day by the most distinctive leaders. The writers include such men as Presidents Aydelotte, Mason, Wilkins and Lowell, and Professors Tatlock and Surette.

The papers are divided into the following nine groups: "Ideals for the Effective College," "The Effective College Curriculum," "Faculty-Student Relationships," "Effective Teaching," "The Promotion of Scholarship," "Music and the Arts of Design," "Religion in the Effective College," "Financing the Effective College," and "The College of the Future."

* * * * * * *

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE is a book to give encouragement to the increasing number of thoughtful persons within and without the campus who are weary of the college as a degree-mill and earnestly desire the reassertion of the intellectual character of college education.

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE is sold at $2.00 per copy. Orders sent to the Association of American Colleges, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., will be promptly filled.

EXPERIMENTING WITH THE COLLEGE TEACHER'S PROBLEMS

DEAN MELVIN E. HAGGERTY
The University of Minnesota

The material which I wish to discuss briefly we have gathered from three sources—a questionnaire study dealing with changed practices in the field of college education, an analysis of the literature on college education for the decade 1919–1928 inclusive, and a program of the experimental studies of college problems which we have conducted at the University of Minnesota. Material under the first and second headings has been collected by the writer acting as Secretary of a Committee on the Professional Training of College Teachers of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Material to be discussed under the third heading has been developed under the general direction of a Committee on Educational Research at the University of Minnesota, of which the speaker has been Chairman for a period of years. Time will permit only a hasty review of any one of the three groups of data indicated, but such a summary will give a picture of the scope and depth of interest which is now centering toward a better understanding of college education.

Somewhat more than a year ago, we sent to all the colleges which are members of the North Central Association and to a number of others, four very simple questions of this type: Has your institution undertaken recently any changed procedure in regard to the college curriculum? If so, to whom may we write for details? The second question referred to college instruction; the third to matters of student personnel; and the fourth to college organization and administration.

The response to these simple questions was generous. One hundred thirty-five institutions reported that they had

made changes in the reorganization and administration of the institution. Two hundred twenty-two reported the reconstruction of curricula; two hundred fifty-six institutions, changed procedures in the handling of student personnel; and one hundred twenty-two institutions indicated that they were making studies in the field of college instruction. Our purpose in this initial query was to secure a list of institutions to whom we could send a more elaborate questionnaire, amounting to sixteen pages, and covering in considerable detail the nature of these changed practices.

The number of replies to the second inquiry dropped materially. We had difficulty in getting responses from a number of the institutions which reported on the first questionnaire that these changed procedures had occurred, and from some of them we got no replies at all. From others we had responses in considerable detail covering one or another of the four parts of this questionnaire. Some reported changes in all phases of the inquiry. The results of this study are reported in the 1929 *Year Book* of the National Society of College Teachers of Education, and reveal an astonishing variety of activities designed to improve the work of the colleges. Since these are of a kind with those reported in the literature, we may discuss the two together.

The second approach we have made to a study of this problem has been in an analysis of the literature published during the past decade. In the beginning it was thought that this analysis would be a relatively simple matter, but as we got into the journals, bulletins, periodicals of one sort and another, and collected the books, the number exceeded our expectations by many titles. The study from this point of view is still very incomplete, but we have at present 1162 titles of college studies, using the term "studies" somewhat liberally.

In the first overview of publications we tried to determine the length of contributions in terms of a standard page of three hundred words. The summary brings to

light about 48,000 pages of material amounting to about 14,500,000 words, as nearly as we can roughly tabulate it, and it comes to us through 128 different avenues of publication. The decade would thus appear to have produced a widely scattered literature in excess of 100 volumes of respectable size on the matter of college education.

In analysis we have roughly divided this material into four categories which are by no means exclusive, but which are useful. In the first division we have placed that material which is published, and, in general, collected, by agencies outside the walls of a particular university or college. To the second group we have allotted all titles relating to the establishment of new colleges distinctly variant from the traditional type of collegiate institution. The third division brings together material relating to the efforts of existing institutions to study and modify their prevailing practices. In the fourth division we placed studies made by individual members of faculties, administrative officers, or others connected with an institution, but studies made apparently without institutional cooperation.

Much of this literature I shall pass over in this discussion. In particular, I neglect those studies published by the Bureau of Education, the General Education Board, the Carnegie Foundation, and like institutions—studies that, for the most part, are made and published by agencies not connected with a particular college. The primary reason for this is that they deal with problems of organization and administration of college education rather than with the matter now before this Association, that of the teacher's problems.

In like manner we shall now omit the second category, namely, that which centers about efforts to establish new colleges. This is a considerable body of literature, dealing largely, again, with problems of organization and administration, although in some cases with curricula, with techniques of instruction, and with problems of personnel. Adequate treatment would require more time than is now available.

Our major concern is with the third group, and since it is not easy to separate this content from that of the fourth group, let us consider the two together. Here we have by far the largest number of titles—studies made by colleges, administrative officers of colleges, or members of the faculties of colleges, and relating to the immediate problems of the institution in which the study is made. There are for the decade more than 1,000 titles in the two groups. If anyone is interested to find out what is going on in the minds of people who have to deal with problems of college education and to find out all that is going on, he is under necessity of reading about 1,000 separate books and articles, making a total of about 8,000,000 words, or about fifty volumes of respectable size.

This array of titles is a striking evidence of the concern which American colleges entertain concerning their own problems. It is equally clear, also, that some of this material is highly important as throwing new light upon many old problems, as well as contributing an analysis and a specification of certain new issues. I shall hurriedly sketch the outline under which we have found it possible to group this entire body of material, both that which derives from the questionnaires and that which we get from the study of the literature. Keep in mind that our questionnaire did not inquire about existing practices, but about changed practices, and also that the literature which we have reviewed is, in general, a discussion of the changed practices and of an evaluation of present practices.

The first important category related to what we may call the changing student body, and the most important item under this deals with the attempts, by various means, to arrive at a finer discrimination of student character, using the word character in its broadest sense. It is clear that the dominant drive actuating more individuals and more institutions than any other single motive is this effort on the part of colleges and teachers to understand better the qualities of students with whom they deal. Interestingly

enough, the particular topic which is the subject of more papers than any other is that of the intelligence tests, which claims 115 titles. Then there are, of course, the familiar topics suggested here both by Dr. Mann and Dean Hawkes, in their survey reports—problems of personal adjustment, the classification of students, the use of objective examinations, orientation courses, scholastic aptitude tests, vocational guidance, and so on. The matter of student records is receiving widespread attention, and there is a great development of new and various advisory agencies.

Although we have greatly increased our activities, I share the feeling expressed by Dean Hawkes, that we may not have gotten very far in improving our services to students in spite of all the attention we have given to new activities in the field of the college student personnel. There is little evidence that the student is better off than he was before. It is far from clear, for instance, that the multiplication of agencies for student counseling has really helped the student. The way has been cleared of a few surface hindrances to facile adjustment to the college situation, but for the more difficult task of the choice of a life-work, the selection and development of useful contacts and friendships, and the mastery of knowledge requisite to the successful pursuit of a complex occupation, most of the agencies which we have reviewed have less to offer than their number and variety would imply is the case. The danger exists that the multiplication of counseling activities may, by diverting attention from profound problems to surface matters, defeat the fundamental aim of educational guidance. Nothing has yet been offered that can be regarded as an effective substitute for the college curriculum and the teaching faculty in these basic matters of guidance. The latter are the agencies that open up to the student the world of knowledge and skill and give him the means of finding his way about in the world of ideas.

While we have done much to help the student find his way about the campus, we have done much less to help him

find his way about in the world of ideas. The basic instrument for this purpose remains his contact with the faculty and the curriculum, which, also, furnishes the student with the very best means of self-appraisal, and places him, if he ever is to have it, in a conscious command of his own resources and his limitations. Counseling agencies can only be useful in so far as they aid the student into and through these fundamental agencies of educational guidance.

The number of counseling agencies in some institutions is, indeed, surprising. In one college a student may receive advice and counsel from any one, or from all, of the following officers and agencies: the president, the college dean—in some cases as many as three of them—the dean of men, the dean of women, the registrar, the department head, faculty advisers—numbers of them—students' health service, the department of physical education and hygiene, including athletic coaches, a variety of special counsellors, such as the psychologist, the psychiatrist, the social worker, the vocational counsellor, and the personnel officer, to say nothing of the multiplicity of student advisers, disinterested and otherwise. Most of this advising is centered upon the hapless freshman who certainly escapes bewilderment only by some protective incapacity to respond to all the variable and often conflicting advising agencies.

It is an interesting fact that while the problems of student personnel stand first in the studies, those of the curriculum stand second. These emphases are in clear contrast to the content treated in the publications comprising the first and second groups of studies where matters of administration and organization hold the dominant rôle. It is the writer's view that this emphasis is distinctly encouraging since it indicates that those who are concerned with college problems are placing first in their thinking the very fundamental educational issue of the student and his curriculum.

Under the second large grouping into which this material falls, that dealing with the matter of remaking the curric-

ulum, the sub-topics are the items of entrance requirements, orientation courses, graduation requirements, new curricula, new courses, the length of the college course, prerequisites to courses and curricula, and lastly, the matter of honors courses and other means of caring for superior students.

Notwithstanding the undoubted evidence of concern for the improvement of the college curriculum, it would not appear that colleges have yet arrived at any well-defined or authenticated principles of curriculum construction. The powerful sway of tradition enshrouds efforts at change and makes progress halting and ineffective, and frequently the smaller institutions seem less able to take an aggressively experimental attitude toward improvement than do some of the larger institutions.

The third grouping of titles has to do with the problems of instruction. Interestingly enough, there have been fewer attacks upon this problem reported in the literature, and the data from our questionnaire on the improvement of teaching confirm this finding. Such attempts as have been made concern more largely the matter of instructional groups, and classification according to ability. The marking system continues to plague colleges everywhere, and some half dozen to a dozen papers are issued each year on the topic, few of which seem to reach any very satisfactory solution. Seventeen papers have to do simply and directly with the problem, and college marks are treated with other issues in about one hundred additional papers and studies. The whole question of improving examinations has had considerable attention, and finally, there is some effort, although very little, as reported in the papers or in the questionnaire, actually to improve methods of teaching through experimental investigation. There is some discussion of this topic, but little controlled experimentation.

For reasons already indicated I shall pass over the matter of changes in administration and organization to be published elsewhere.

But I must cut this discussion short. Let me turn abruptly to the growing movement for the experimental study of college teaching. The work of the Minnesota Committee on Educational Research has already been referred to this morning by President McConaughey and others. Its organization and activities were described by the speaker in the November number of the BULLETIN of this Association. It is but typical of efforts which are now making in a score or more of collegiate institutions. Citations might be made of Iowa, Purdue, Yale, Chicago, Michigan, Northwestern, Stanford, Oregon, and Ohio State among others.

Among the twenty-five and more projects of our committee the problems of evaluating instructional outcomes bulk large, along with those of personnel and curriculum. The class-size experiment which extended over a four year period and which involved more than 6,000 students in a varied group of courses is well known. The results of this study are available in book form under the title *Class Size at the College Level.* This report marks for the University of Minnesota a new approach to the study of its own problems, namely, that of experimental investigation. You have here not merely an examination of the university records, but the conscious attempt to set up experimental teaching situations, to control the contributing factors, and to measure the influence of a single factor. As a method of studying college education this program can be made to bear large fruitage in the consideration of educational problems. If the investigation had done nothing more than to demonstrate the possibility of the experimental method as applied to the problems of college education, this study would have large significance. Such demonstration is probably more important in the long run than any specified finding concerning the effectiveness of instruction in classes of different sizes. Extensions of this study are now in progress in departments not touched in the report.*

* Other projects of our Committee that might be named are the following:

In addition to the report on class size five other volumes have appeared or are in the process of publication. The titles of these are: *Problems of College Education,* edited by Earl Hudelson, Professor of Education; *Extra-Curricular Activities,* by F. Stuart Chapin, Professor of Sociology; *Problems of Science Teaching at the College Level,* by A. W. Hurd, Instructor and Assistant Director of the Bureau of Educational Research; *Curricular Problems in Science at the College Level,* by P. O. Johnson, Assistant Professor and Executive Secretary of the Land-Grant College Survey; *Student Marks in University Courses,* by John E. Bohan, Associate Professor of Education, University of West Virginia.

Dr. Palmer Johnson's investigation in the botanical courses developed very interesting facts in regard to the permanence of student learning. The results which have been briefly described by the writer in a paper on "The Improvement of Medical Instruction"* should temper

1. An Analysis of the Marking System at the University of Minnesota.
2. The Mental Hygiene of College Students.
3. The College Teaching of Science.
   a. Laboratory Instruction in Human Anatomy.
   b. The Value of Laboratory Instruction in Human Physiology.
   c. The Value of Laboratory Instruction in College Physics—Mechanics.
   d. The Effect of Class Size in College Physics—Heat.
   e. Some Determinants of Achievement in College Physics—Magnetism and Electricity.
   f. A Study of Prognosis in College Physics.
   g. A Study of Prognosis in Human Anatomy.
   h. Laboratory Instruction in College Chemistry.
   i. The Value of Pre-requisite Courses in College Botany.
4. The Reading Problems of College Students.
5. Comparative Scholastic Standing of Athletes.
6. The Nature and Function of Pre-requisite Courses.
7. The Characteristics of Superior College Teachers.
8. Instruction in Clinical Medicine.

* Haggerty, M. E. —"The Improvement of Medical Instruction." *Bulletin* of the Association of Medical Colleges, January, 1929.

considerably our expectations as to what students will get out of college study. When we discover that from forty to fifty per cent of what students know on a final examination is gone beyond effective recall within a three months' period, we may well ask ourselves numerous questions about what we are attempting to do to students.

I shall take time for a statement of only one other project upon which we are working. I choose this one because of its intimate relation to the general theme of this conference, though the study is yet in its initial stages. With the aid of a large committee of the university faculty we have set about a study of the characteristics of superior college teachers. As thus far developed, the method involves four lines of attack. First of all, we are making a study of the biographical literature relating to great teachers of the last hundred years—men like Huxley, Agassiz, Wayland, Hall, Hopkins, McCosh, and a long list of similarly conspicuous college instructors. What we are asking is, What did these men do to students and how did they do it? What traits and modes of behavior sufficed to leave behind them a long line of inspired disciples? The second phase of the study attempts to secure from men now living a description of more recent instructors of singularly great eminence. We are asking the students of men like Jordan, Armstrong, Childs, Sumner, Wilson, James, Bascom, and others to detail as accurately as they may, the qualities and methods of the men they knew, the men whose teaching led them into a life of scholarship or into other useful life careers.

We are, also, seeking light upon the characteristics of superior teachers by the more direct method of the observation of superior teaching. Dr. F. W. Lathrop, who is the chief worker upon this project, has been at work developing a method for the objective recording of what transpires in a recitation period. He has hit upon a technique that is usable by a trained observer and that bids fair to give statistically reliable results. When the method for this

part of the study is perfected, it is proposed to observe the class room activities of certain admittedly good teachers on our own university faculties, and possibly also in other colleges.

A fourth device is the stenographic report of recitations, lectures, etc., a method which has already been successfully used in studies of instruction elsewhere.

The results of this study may not be prejudged, but already it is clear that the project is rich in possibilities. We may not discover the single factor that makes a teacher superior, for, as Dr. Mann suggested a moment ago, the qualities and activities of such teachers are varied, and possibly unique to the individual. To display something of this variety will in itself be a result of great interest and value, and this we shall certainly be able to do in a more objective and comprehensive way than it has yet been done.

In closing, I should like to stress again the point that we need in our colleges an experimental attack upon the problems of college teaching. Few persons, whether in academic or educational departments, are in a position to set themselves up to give a course of a semester in length on how to conduct recitations in any particular college subject, and the effort that is making in some places to establish formal courses for instruction in college methods is in danger of running ahead of the hounds. We need ten years of experimental work on the problem of college teaching, on the techniques of making curricula, upon the methods of student marking and student examinations and student evaluation before we can really offer much that is sound and reliable in the way of courses in the teaching of college subjects.

I do not mean to say that all efforts to improve instruction should be delayed. We must meet the immediate situation in the best way we can, and it will be useful to offer to young instructors and to graduate students preparing for college teaching such systematized knowledge as we may gather together on the problems of college in-

struction. But while we do this, we should seek to extend that knowledge through experimentation of the most thoroughgoing sort. This is, in my judgment, the inescapable task that faces both your institution and mine, and challenges us all in the whole matter of improving college teaching.

After all, a country's greatest resource is the untrained talent of its rising generation. To search this out and give it full opportunity is surely a good philosophy for a democracy. Whether we represent the endowed or the publicly supported institutions, there rests on all alike the imperative obligation to exercise to the uttermost such creative imagination, such wisdom and energy and devotion as we can command, to meet the bewildering educational needs of our time and people. If the greatest experiment in self-government ever undertaken by man is to avoid the pitfalls of pervasive vulgarity and meretricious ignorance, masquerading as sophisticated intelligence; if it is to survive the sinister influences of political corruption and commercial greed; if it is to come into its heritage of great intellectual and spiritual achievement, which shall furnish the indispensable counterpart and complement to its unprecedented material accumulations, it is chiefly to education that we must look. The development of that education will call for all those human qualities of courage and vision and self-sacrifice which we justly esteem most highly. We may well pray that we be not found wanting in this supreme test of our national life.—*James R. Angell, Yale University.*

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE

PRESIDENT W. W. BOYD
The Western College for Women, Chairman

The Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure reports on two matters:

First. There has been established a cordial feeling between this Association and the American Association of University Professors whereby efforts are being made by all parties concerned to promote and protect definitely academic development, research and absolute freedom in trying to think toward truth while establishing at the same time a caution regarding hasty pronouncements and provocative expression which may bring criticism upon both institutions and teachers. There is little disposition on the part of university professors to defend inefficiency or harmful personal eccentricity. Neither is there a desire on the part of administrators to use arbitrary methods in dealing with academic matters or people. There is a growing tendency to recognize that where differences arise they can be composed most easily by sitting about a table and taking time to talk things through. Where differences can not be adjusted, it becomes necessary at times to submit the problems involved to boards of trustees, as the final court of appeal.

Second. With this in mind, your Commission thought it might be proper and well to go a step farther than we did last year and send to each institution in this Association enough copies of the resolutions pertaining to academic freedom and academic tenure passed by this Association to be able to place a copy in the hands of each member of every board of trustees. This was done last May, nearly six thousand copies of the resolutions being sent to the presi-

dents of our institutions for distribution to trustees. No request was made that trustees endorse our action. But it was made known that we would be glad to have reports on the reaction of the boards of trustees to our pronouncements.

The replies have been more meager than we had hoped, but enough replies have been received to lead to some judgments:

1. Some executives seem to fear to bring the matter before their boards for discussion.
2. Some seemed to think that the boards would get into endless discussion, if the resolutions were brought forward.
3. Many boards have already adopted resolutions quite in harmony with the expressions of our resolutions.
4. In a few instances where the resolutions were submitted, there was an absolute acceptance and approval by the boards.
5. A few college presidents who voted for the resolutions when they were presented to this Association declined to recommend them to their boards, as they took exception to some of the phraseology used.
6. There seems to be a general agreement in spirit with the purpose of our resolutions.

Your Commission feels that there is little more that can be done at present as full publicity has been given to the latest pronouncements of this Association. The Commission recommends, therefore, that it be discharged.

It recommends further that each year a committee of two members of this association be sent to the meeting of the American Association of University Professors and that that Association be invited to send each year a committee to our meetings.

Editorial Note

In presenting his report, President Boyd made the following comments. Before reading the paragraph beginning, *"Second,"* he said:

While the college professors have a distinct organization of their own and proceeded some years ago to demand certain rights somewhat on the order of a labor union, which they never meant should be their attitude at all, there has never been an association of administrators nearer than this Association of American Colleges. This is largely made up of executives at least. Maybe I ought to say "executors" from the point of view of the professor, for the administrators really are boards of trustees.

We need to think of that when talking about the responsibilities that belong to colleges. Nevertheless, this organization representing on one side administrators, and the professors representing on the other side that opportunity to study and broaden the field of knowledge,—these two organizations together have afforded the opportunity to approach the question from both sides so that we might produce harmony in our relationships to one another if possible, and it has been accomplished. I bring that fact out.

Following the second sentence in the same paragraph he said:

Last year we sent a copy to each president and asked him to present it at the board meetings. This year we sent more copies to the presidents so they might distribute them to members personally and thus every trustee be informed. That was the main thing—propaganda taken to them that they might be informed on how we stand as an association of administrators while, at the same time, we have had the approval of the American Association of University Professors to exactly the same pronouncement.

At the conclusion of the report, Dr. Boyd made the following statement:

As part of the duties of this Commission two or three of them are asked to go to the annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors. We were very cordially received by the members of this Association, which met in New York City December 31 and January 1. A number of very interesting

questions were discussed by the professors. They asked us especially to take into consideration by announcement only one thing. They did want our Association to know that they are organizing a bureau for the purpose of making it profitable, if possible, for college executives to find teachers they need. It is not on the same order as a teachers' agency, but to give professors an opportunity, if necessity seems to arise, of finding positions that might be acceptable to them. That bureau is to have its headquarters in the City of Washington, and it is the desire on the part of the American Association of University Professors that the executives of our colleges make use of that bureau when the time comes.

They also appointed two representatives to come to this Association, Professor David W. Cornelius, who is the professor of physics here in the University of Chattanooga, and Dr. L. R. Hessler from the University of Tennessee. I should like to ask them to present greetings from the American Association of University Professors at this time.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS

DIRECTOR CHARLES R. MANN
The American Council on Education, Chairman

During the past year the Bureau of Education has completed the gathering of statistics and facts in the survey of the Land Grant Colleges. The work of the reduction and preparation of the report is now in progress. In addition to the appropriation of $117,000, an appropriation of $8,000 for the next fiscal year will enable the Bureau to complete the report and publish it.

At its annual meeting last March, the North Central Association initiated a movement to secure an appropriation for the Bureau of Education "to make a study of the organization, administration, financing and work of secondary schools and of their articulation with elementary and higher education." A special committee of the North Central Association and other similar regional associations presented a plea for such an appropriation before the House Committee on Education at its hearings on April 26th. The suggestion was supported by the National Education Association, the American Council on Education and others, with the result that an appropriation of $225,000 has just been made to enable the Bureau of Education to carry on this national study for the next three years. Of this, $50,000 is available for the first year's work, beginning July 1, 1929.

The State of Maine has organized a survey of the needs of that state for higher education. This survey is under direction of the University of Maine, with the cooperation of Bowdoin, Bates and Colby Colleges. Its basic purpose is to determine whether the facilities for higher education in Maine are adequate to the needs of the people there for

higher education. West Virginia has completed and published a state survey under direction of C. H. Judd, of Chicago.

The survey of the Lutheran colleges, conducted under the supervision of Dr. Leonard, of Columbia, has been completed and the report will soon be ready for issue. A similar survey among Presbyterian colleges (North), under the supervision of Dr. C. C. McCracken, of Ohio State, is in progress. The cooperative study of Pennsylvania colleges under the direction of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is well under way and making admirable progress. A notable feature of this survey was the giving last June of the same comprehensive new type tests to all seniors in all Pennsylvania colleges. The statistical reduction of the scores is now in progress and is yielding some striking results with regard to what the various institutions have done for their respective students.

Boston and Kentucky Universities report thorough self-surveys, in which a special committee has been appointed to make an intensive study of each of the various schools. Minnesota is continuing its extensive and well-known studies. At the University of Pittsburgh, a Division of Educational Research has been established for the purpose of conducting self-study of all phases of university work. A brief description of the organization and operations of this Division is printed in the current number of the *Educational Record* for January, 1929.

In the report of this Commission last year, larger state and institutional surveys were mentioned. This year it seemed desirable to the Commission to go more into detail and find out what special studies and experiments individual institutions are carrying on as part of their regular routine. In order to gather the required information, a circular letter, not a questionnaire, was sent to the institutions that are members of this Association. The letter merely asked the question whether the institution is conducting any educational experiments or studies which it

would like to have mentioned in this report. Up to January 1, 139 colleges, one third of those invited, have sent in a reply.

Twenty-two of the 139 reported that they are making no experiments which they consider of interest to the Association. The total number of studies or experiments mentioned by the remaining 107 institutions is 309. This indicates a very healthy disposition to experiment in these institutions.

The experiments listed fall naturally into two groups as follows. The number after each item indicates the number of times the particular item was mentioned in the letters.

Curriculum revision, 32; Requirements of graduation for A.B. and B.S., 10; Entrance plan and requirements, 9; Substitution of achievement for credits, 9; Psychological and intelligence tests, 8; College teacher, 8; Student time, 6; Systematic broadening—comprehensive courses for juniors and seniors, 6; Freedom of planning major, 6; Adjustment to needs of state and local environment, 6; Objectives and aims, 6; Substituting fields of study for course units, 5; Continuing records, 5; Extension work and parent education, 5; Distinction between first two years and last two—distribution *vs.* concentration, 5; Faculty organization and routine, 4; Distribution of grades, 4; Financial needs, 4; Building needs, 3; Program development, 3; Articulation among courses, 2; Duplication of work, 2; Library use, 2; Junior college centers affiliated, 2; Integrate scientific study and research, 2; Informal study, 2; Faculty study of teaching problems, 2; Number of courses per department—catalogue fragments, 2; Facilities for research, 1; Registrar's office, 1; Ratio of students to faculty, 1; Foreign studies, 1; Probation, 1; Liberate faculty for research, 1; Unit costs, 1; Health and recreation facilities, 1; Publicity, 1; Unit colleges, 1; Financial aid for students—scholarships and loans, 1; Size of college and plant capacity, 1.

The experiments listed in the foregoing group are clearly directed toward improving the mechanism of college ad-

ministration and operation under the guidance of expanding conceptions of what the colleges ought to do for the students. As far as can be judged from the letters, these experiments are following the usual procedure of formulating in general terms the results which college education ought to attain and then modifying procedures in the manner that seems likely to increase what may be called the teaching efficiency.

The second group of experiments indicates a somewhat different trend. These are: Creating opportunities for exceptional students in honors courses, 17; Special student honors, 15; Orientation courses, 12; Sectioning according to ability, 9; Personal attention to students, 9; Student opinions of curriculum and needs of the college, 7; Vocational and educational guidance, 6; Extra-curriculum activities, 6; Developing examinations to test thinking, 6; Comprehensive examinations, 6; Faculty advisers, 6; Development of personal responsibility, 5; Alumni opinion on curriculum needs, 5; Aptitude tests, 5; Modes of instruction, 3; Personnel work, 2; Measuring efficiency of teaching by tests, 2; Social groups, 2; Bogey scores, 2; Relation of housing to student work and welfare, 2; Supervised studying, 1; Study of correlation of I.Q. with grades, 1; Study of student attitudes, 1; Chapel service, 1; Student rating of teachers, 1; What alumni are doing, 1; Exploration courses, 1; Two-year selective readings, 1; Department tutoring, 1; How to help students diagnose weaknesses, 1.

The characteristic feature of this group appears to be the evident effort to appraise and reliably measure the changes actually produced in young people by the college mechanism. That 137 experiments are being made toward developing objective measures of the excellencies and defects of the product of college operations is a most encouraging sign of progress.

The Modern Foreign Language Study, which has just been completed under the sponsorship of the American Council on Education, has followed both of the types of

procedure just outlined. Five volumes of the report deal with description and analysis of the mechanism of foreign language instruction and the results which that mechanism should secure. The other eight volumes of the report place in the hands of foreign language teachers instruments both for measuring objectively what students are getting from language instruction and for improving the mechanics of instruction so as to secure better results. Both procedures are now recognized as essential to real progress, though the recognition of the importance of objective study of the quality of the product as a basis of modifying school mechanism is a relatively recent development.

The recent rapid trend toward studying human activities on the basis of objective appraisals of the changes which those activities produce in men and women is not confined to education. In a very significant recent book, *The American Omen,* Garet Garrett analyzes the industrial and economic situation from the same point of view. He cites striking examples of effective industrial progress that have been secured by studying the changes produced in workers by industrial organization and operation. All who are interested in this phase of the subject are recommended to read this book and ponder its contents.

A similar trend is observable in political life. Legislation is being analyzed more and more from the point of view of the changes the legal system produces in men and women and less from considerations of what laws ought to do. Those who are interested in this phase of the subject are recommended to read and study John Dewey's recent book on *The Public and Its Problems.*

* * * *

I should like to make an application of the principles stated in the report to the discussions of this meeting. I have followed them with a great deal of interest and found the discussions and the papers to be of remarkably interesting quality, and in some cases inspiring. But I have the feeling myself that the discussion of the central topic of this meeting, the college teacher, has been left in a

rather vague and hazy condition—it is so in my own mind—because the various speakers have spoken from different points of view and used different terminologies and different methods of presenting their ideas. If I were to attempt to pick teachers and develop methods of improving their teaching quality on the basis of the discussion of this meeting, I would have to think and reason a good deal before I could pick out practical suggestions that would be really helpful.

I have, therefore, written down four brief statements which seem to express almost self-evident axioms which may help carry home some definite practical notions of what might be done in the way of experimenting with this teacher question in a manner to get greater results from the very useful discussions here.

By way of introduction may I suggest that this teacher matter is not a problem? It has been spoken of throughout the meeting as a problem. To me a problem is something that can be solved by thinking and discussion and working on paper. I should rather call this teacher situation a challenge, because a challenge requires action.

My first thesis is, that great teachers are found in every walk of life. The subject has been discussed through the meeting as though all great teachers are in schools and colleges. It is not necessary to argue this further than to call attention to the fact that there are many great teachers in the church, in the law, in the medical profession, in the army and in business. If we recognize that fact it helps us get a clearer picture of what some of the fundamental essentials of a great teacher are.

The second thesis is, that every great teacher's personality and method of work are unique. That also needs no argument. You all recognize that if you gathered together all the great teachers that were mentioned in Dr. Kelly's report, you would find every one had a different personality and a different way of working; yet they are selected for some reason as being great teachers. It follows that it is

very difficult, if not impossible, to define a great teacher so that you can pick him out of a crowd of people on the basis of personality, or of attempted definitions of personality.

The third thesis is: "The great teacher is revealed by what he does to people." That tells how we find out whether or not a man is a great teacher, namely, by observing what effect he has on the students. That is the ordinary, everyday method of finding out what are the particular qualities of different individuals. We note what they do in their day's work or to people, and we judge their powers and qualities by what we observe them do. The same applies to the teacher. The great teacher is revealed by what he does to people, to students; or if he is in the army, to the soldiers; or if he is in business, to his employees.

Finally then, if we want to know how to pick a great teacher and discover teaching capacity, we must know what particular kinds of things we want the man to do to the student. If we can define the effects or results of his contact with students, then we know how to find men who produce that type of result on their friends and other people with whom they are associated.

There are, perhaps, eight or ten fundamental effects that great teachers have on their students. I am sure that the list is short and that it contains only recognizable actions from the fact that we all can agree on who are great teachers because we have common instinctive ideas of what kinds of effects they have on the students. As a working hypothesis, then, may I submit as the fourth thesis in this argument: Distinguishing works of a great teacher are: first, he decentralizes responsibility for learning. I think you will all agree that the great teacher makes the student realize that he, the student, is responsible for his own education, and that if the teacher gets the student by some method to assume, himself, the responsibility of his own education, he is a great teacher and can serve that student in a most fundamental way.

As a second of the works of the great teacher, I suggest: He stimulates persistent thought. In other words, he gets the students so interested or enthusiastic that they cannot let go of the problems. They cannot refrain from accepting the challenges that come to them because of the spirit and attitude which the teacher has somehow developed in them.

As a third important factor, I suggest: He fosters religious faith. This is in line with the discussion of yesterday afternoon. There are others, perhaps five or six others, of the sort that are observable and appraisable. Such actions as these give clues as to the kind of men that are capable of becoming great teachers, as to the kind of men who are great teachers, and as to the processes that must be used in making teachers and developing their powers of teaching.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGE PERSONNEL TECHNIQUE

DEAN HERBERT E. HAWKES
Columbia University

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: President Hopkins, in behalf of the Commission on College Personnel Technique, sent to the members of this Association a very short, and as he thought, simple questionnaire to which he requested answers. On account of the influenza epidemic, President Hopkins has been obliged to close his institution which has confused his calendar to such an extent that he cannot be here today. He has asked me to give the results of the questionnaire which he has sent out, and which I can do in a very few moments.

In regard to this whole matter of personnel technique, it seems to President Hopkins, as it seems to me, that there is a good deal of confusion. In the first place, if we do not look out we are likely to feel that personnel work is an end in itself and to disassociate it from the central work of the college as an educational institution.

As I said, personnel work in a college ought to be brought to bear at the point where the main work of the college is done, namely, in the relation of the instructor to the student. Personnel work in any dean's office, or in any personnel office, is of practically little use unless it reaches the instructor. It cannot perform the function which it ought to perform. Furthermore, all of us are organizing various personnel services in various fields and are not bringing them together, so as to afford a picture of the boy or the girl in any composite way. The medical service, the adviser system, and the testing apparatus are carried on each in water-tight compartments, none of them knowing what the rest are doing.

Unless that condition can first be recognized and then be cured so that these various personnel services embrace a cooperative enterprise, and unless this cooperative enterprise which embraces all elements of the personnel service can in some way, so far as it is pertinent, be brought to bear at the focus of the collegiate work in the relation between the student and his instructor, it seems to me we run a great risk of dissipating a lot of energy and obscuring the work that we are really trying to accomplish.

President Hopkins asked the various institutions in this Association to answer six questions in regard to whether these institutions have (1) faculty advisers; (2) medical service; (3) psychological tests; (4) personnel records; (5) scholastic records; and (6) any facility for personnel research.

I shall not read the entire report but content myself with a brief résumé. He received a total of 335 replies. In reply to the question as to how many of these institutions have a system of faculty advisers, he received 256 positive replies out of 335. There were sixty-six colleges which said they had no such system.

In answer to the question as to whether there is a medical service to which the students may go or be sent for examination or consultation, 280 colleges answered, "Yes," and thirty-nine answered, "No."

In answer to the question as to whether the institution used any of the so-called psychological tests for intelligence, mental alertness, aptitudes, or achievements, of the 335 colleges, 275 answered, "Yes," and only thirty-nine answered, "No." It is interesting to observe that just as many say "No" to the question of psychological tests as say "No" to the existence of a health service.

I have here a list of nearly three pages giving the variety of tests that are used by these 275 different institutions. There are in all 124 different tests listed as in use by these various institutions, a very pleasing variety.

In answer to Question 4: *Do you keep complete records of individual students, frequently called "personnel*

records," separate and distinct from the records of the Registrar's Office? 174 answered, "Yes," and 136 answered, "No."

Question 5. *Does any agency in the institution know of the quality of scholastic work of the individual students during, but before the end of, any semester or term?* Three hundred and twelve answered, "Yes"; only nine answered, "No."

Question 6. *Is there any agency on your campus carrying on research in the field of education or personnel?* Of the 335 institutions, 152 answered, "Yes"; 163 answered, "No."

All that is interesting enough, but it isn't of paramount significance so far as I can see. The point comes in the next question. Here are the six important personnel techniques which many of us are using to a greater or less extent. The next question is: *To what extent are these techniques tied together; that is, to what extent is there any one individual in the college who knows what is going on in all of these six fields?* That is the real question. I think that the reason President Hopkins sent out this questionnaire was in order to get an answer to this question.

Is there any member of the administration or faculty who has readily available and constantly utilizes information from all six of these sources in his personnel contacts with individual students. If so, what is his position? One hundred eighty-six of the 335 institutions replying, answered, "Yes," to this question, that there was some one individual who was familiar with all six of these fields. The fact that 186 institutions say that there is some individual member of the administration or faculty who has readily available information from all six of these sources leaves me in a somewhat puzzled state of mind, since the answer to two of the six questions did not receive an affirmative response from as many as 186 institutions. I am therefore in a certain amount of doubt as to just what the answer to that question may mean, except that ap-

parently it does mean that a majority of the institutions that are doing this kind of work make an attempt at any rate to tie it together.

When it comes to the tabulation of the particular officer to whom all of this information comes, there is naturally a very considerable divergence of replies. Generally speaking, it is the dean or the dean of men to whom all of this information from these six sources comes, but there is a full page of titles of college officers who are named once each by various institutions. They are mostly deans of some kind.

The rest of President Hopkins' questionnaire has to do with the number of institutions in which five or four or three of these sources are brought together, and information from a smaller number than six is available through some individual. I don't think these results are particularly significant because one cannot tell exactly what is meant by the answers to the questions. That is, if an institution replies that there is an officer who has information from five different sources, whether those who have information from all six should be included, I do not know. This point is not made clear in the tabulated results. Consequently, so far as I can see, the significance of this report rests chiefly on the evidence that there is a very considerable number of institutions doing personnel work in these various directions and, what is more important, that there is a surprisingly large number of institutions that are attempting to bring the information together so that it is available, in the dean's office or in the office of some other appropriate officer of the college

Whether that information, or the part of that information which is pertinent for the officer of instruction ever gets to him, so that in his dealings with the student the information is available, the report does not indicate.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN THE FINE ARTS

PRESIDENT FREDERICK C. FERRY
Hamilton College, Chairman

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The Commission with the longest name proposes to make the shortest report. Your Commission is happy in reporting that the long-awaited volume, *College Architecture in America—And Its Part in the Development of the Campus*, is very soon to be published. This book has been written by Messrs. Charles Z. Klauder and Herbert C. Wise, of Philadelphia. It has been carefully reviewed by Dr. Keppel and Dr. Kelly. It is coming from the press of Charles Scribner's Sons, and will cost $5.00. The Carnegie Corporation, at the instance of Dr. Keppel, has contributed generously towards its production, and in particular has made possible the inclusion of many illustrations. Without this assistance the book could hardly have been brought out at all.

In another direction the Carnegie Corporation has greatly fostered the interests in the field of your Commission. It is giving and has given yearly for some time a considerable number of scholarships for the assistance of those preparing for the teaching of art in the colleges. This work can be expected to prove of great advantage to collegiate instruction.

Announcement has already been made of the fact that the report on the teaching of art in a selected list of American colleges made by Miss Lura Beam in 1925–1926 can be secured in typewritten form from the Secretary's office.

An attempt has been made to respond, at Dr. Kelly's suggestion, to various appeals for opinions concerning matters pertaining to the Commission's subject. It is inevitable

that such opinions should be of far less value than would be the case if the Commission had an expert at hand for such purposes. An investigation was undertaken for the finding of such a man and a suitable candidate was discovered. His service proved, however, to be of far greater cost than was within the financial reach of the Association. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that some day this organization may be able to employ a consulting architect whose knowledge shall be available for the answering of questions propounded in his field by the associated colleges.

Among the questions which the Commission has been requested to consider is that of the provision of museum space in suitable college buildings and the arrangement of museum material therein. Many a college museum fails to fulfil any worthy purpose at all. Its space is ill-placed and badly lighted, its material dusty and neglected. Hardly ever does a visitor disturb its quiet and none comes twice within its walls. It is possible for much of this neglected material to be made decorative, or at least presentable, by placing it in suitably designed corridors and hallways where the undergraduate, passing daily, gradually becomes acquainted with some fossil, bird, rock, art object or curio, which he would never see in a secluded museum.

The towns of America are following the cities in devoting time and care to the arrangement of parks, streets and buildings in such fashion as shall contribute to the beauty of the place. The graduates of our colleges must in general have a hand in this work, for they will be appointed to the committees in charge. Even though a college gives no course in town-planning, it should at least develop an appreciation of such work through making and keeping the campus a place where not only buildings, roads and walks, but shrubs, trees and lawns as well, join in making a region of great charm.

The chapter on campus in the forthcoming volume will not be equally instructive for all natural settings of colleges. The grounds, as well as the buildings, must be

adapted to the geography, the climate and the character of the institution in each instance. The best of books on college architecture will still need the interpretation which only men of taste can give. The colleges of liberal arts still have a long way to travel before they will reach the goal of the desirable in appreciation of art. The work of this Commission cannot yet be counted nearly finished.

COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE IN AMERICA—AND ITS PART IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CAMPUS

By Charles Z. Klauder and Herbert C. Wise

Table of Contents

Foreword by Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges
Authors' Preface
Chapter
I—Introductory and Retrospective
II—Controlling Factors
III—General Development Plans
IV—Administration and Academic Buildings
V—Libraries
VI—Chapels and Auditoriums
VII—Men's Dormitories
VIII—Women's Dormitories
IX—Dining-Halls and Cafeterias
X—Buildings for the Natural Sciences
XI—Engineering Buildings and Central Heating Plants
XII—Art Buildings and Museums
XIII—Structures for Athletics
XIV—Buildings for Student and Faculty Welfare
XV—Sundry Important Considerations
XVI—Professional Advisers and the Building Operation

It is expected that College Architecture in America—And Its Part in the Development of the Campus will be ready for distribution about May 1. Written by competent men and profusely illustrated with the best cuts available, the book will be an authoritative treatment of this important subject for some time to come. Advance orders may now be placed with the Association office. The volume is offered by special cooperation from the Carnegie Corporation at $5.00 per copy.

COOPERATION BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN RAISING INTELLECTUAL STANDARDS

Report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship

Dean Raymond Walters
Swarthmore College, Chairman

Part I—A Look Backward

To leaf over quickly certain pages of American educational history should prove an encouraging introduction to this report on present cooperation of schools and colleges in raising intellectual standards. Encouraging because, short of ideal as the cooperation of today may be, it represents blissful harmony as compared with the relationships of preceding eras.

A lack of friendliness between colleges and schools is evidenced in many a document and publication extending from the colonial period to the beginning of the twentieth century. In the early days of the thirteen sea-board colonies, the few colleges—Harvard, William and Mary, Yale and others—were themselves secondary schools in curriculum and discipline. They received their pupils, usually upon examination given by the president of the college, from straggling grammar schools and peripatetic tutors. Throughout the Revolutionary War period and after, the schoolmaster was apt to be an Ichabod Crane who boarded around among the families of the children he taught. As to the schools, their equipment and standards, as late as the 1820's, we get the view-point of the college undergraduate in Emerson's journal entry of December 15, 1822, with its reference to "the hot, steaming, stoved, stinking, A-B spelling-school room" in Cambridge.

From the Mexican War to long after the Civil War the common schools, or so-called free schools, were not expected to prepare pupils for college. That was left to the private academies and to the preparatory departments of colleges. Perplexing indeed were the problems of academies which undertook to prepare students for different colleges. Typical of the lack of cooperation of the colleges during the period from 1865 to 1890 is the school situation set forth by John Tetlow, a school man writing in the 'eighties:

> A class containing pupils fitting for each of these three colleges (New England) must either be broken up into three classes in French or must do at least double the amount required by any one college in the group.

The first dove of peace sent across this troubled sea was the formation in 1884 of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools. The way of cooperation pointed out and exemplified by these school and college men was followed in the Middle Atlantic States in 1887, when the present Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland was established. Five years later came the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and in 1895 the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges. Since 1906 the activities of regional associations and state associations have been steadied and brought to a focus by the National Conference on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

President Eliot, of Harvard, was one of the pioneers in the fight to reform the abuses of varying and arbitrary college entrance requirements. He was chairman of the famous Committee of Ten of the National Education Association in 1891. It was his suggestion which led to the establishment by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia, in 1900, of the College Entrance Examination Board, an association of both schools and colleges which works through commissions in defining entrance standards.

Taking the country as a whole, the outstanding influence has been the public school doctrine which seeks "to corre-

late all grades of schools, from the kindergarten to the college, so that there shall be a straight and open pathway from the lowest to the highest." This doctrine produced the certificate system of admission which, beginning in the Middle West, has spread to all parts of the country and is now the predominant method of entrance to colleges, both private and public.

Lest it should appear, not quite truly, that the millenium of school and college cooperation has come, let us interpolate the sharp protest against current practices of the colleges uttered a few years ago (February, 1925) before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Superintendent F. D. Boynton, of Ithaca, N. Y., asking "What can the colleges do for the schools?" gave, among others, these answers:

> They can assure the open door of opportunity by the provision of higher training for a much wider variety of mental endowment . . . ; they can give a square deal to freshmen by providing expert teaching . . . ; they can and should provide supervision and correlation of college courses . . . ; they . . . should be subject to survey.

These and similar subjects are the earnest concern of college administrators and there is little left of the gods-on-high-Olympus attitude to which Superintendent Boynton objected.

Part II—Movements and Measures of Intellectual Cooperation

Of the problems which today puzzle college people perhaps the most discussed is how, devoting full attention to training citizens of a democracy, similar service can be done for educating intellectual leaders of a democracy.

Cooperation between schools and colleges for the past quarter of a century has raised the average scholastic preparation of the freshman army—the one hundred and fifty thousand school graduates who enter college gates each September.

Can cooperation between schools and colleges help to raise intellectual standards for some, if not all; the term intellectual assuming thorough knowledge plus what Matthew Arnold called "the free play of the mind on all subjects?"

Toward this end certain American colleges have, during the past half dozen years, developed Honors courses and tutorial courses. A few secondary schools have, during the past two years, begun similar plans, and now there are in progress movements and measures of cooperation between schools and colleges having this same general purpose.

This study aims to report these movements and measures.

Cooperation Between City High Schools and Universities

Two instances of cooperation toward intellectual improvement which have democratic significance because of their public character are the activities of the University of Washington, combining with the high schools of Seattle, and the program of the University of Buffalo, combining with the high schools of Buffalo.

For some months a joint committee representing five departments of the Seattle high schools and the University of Washington studied methods of bringing about a better correlation between high school and university work. The fields considered were English, mathematics, history, social science, natural science and foreign languages. In each field the committee listed the weaknesses of university freshmen and then suggested corrections. The committee's report, made recently to Dr. M. Lyle Spencer, President of the University, and to City Superintendent T. R. Cole, brought out aspects of senior class subjects which may be handled in a scholarly way. In the section relating to English, for example, the committee suggests that "senior composition should take on more of the university attitude, which consists of gathering information, digesting it, and organizing a logical and intelligent presentation of the

material." "Use of the library in gathering materials" is stressed.

At Buffalo cooperation between the schools and the university began about two years ago with a conference on problems of mutual interest. The participants were the principals and vice-principals of all the local secondary schools, both public and private, and representatives of the universities. Out of this came a permanent committee, appointed by Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, representing all interests concerned.

Certain steps in better articulation between high school and college have already been taken, such, for example, as giving college credit, upon examination, for work done in school, and the expression of entrance requirements where possible not in terms of hours or courses but in terms of standards of attainment.

The University of Buffalo has had Honors courses since 1923. It now proposes a downward extension of the Honors method. Dean Julian Park, of the College of Arts and Sciences, states the plan as follows:

> The Buffalo project aims at selecting a limited number of upper level students in the junior year of their high school, so helping them in their selection of the remainder of their school program and also giving them such additional training both during their school course and especially during both summers, that they may enter college with a considerable amount of their junior college training completed. Such students would be admitted to the senior division of the college entirely on the basis of total accomplishment and ability rather than fulfillment of formal course requirements. The average of these students would perhaps spend one year instead of two years in the junior division. They would then be treated in the senior college as Honors students. At the end of that period they would be advised to go for the most part either into professional training or graduate academic work on the basis of their interests and abilities. Such students as elected the latter would be started on the field of investigation on which their graduate work would

be conducted, before the completion of their undergraduate period, there being as little break in continuity as possible; the first year of graduate study would be made the objective rather than the completion of the undergraduate period.

Such a scheme as this is perhaps adapted only to an institution situated in a large city where it can have frequent contact with the schools which would furnish it its first material. One or more liaison officers would be appointed from the college faculty to consult on school programs from the university point of view.

A Conference on Honors Work, Secondary School Administrators of the Middle Atlantic States

The ways in which certain schools, including one large city high school, are using the Honors method of instruction for some of their pupils were described at a conference of secondary school administrators of the Middle Atlantic States, held December 14, 1927, at Swarthmore College. There were in attendance more than 250 persons, representing about one hundred public and private schools and a half dozen colleges.

Discussion centered upon three questions, phrased as follows by President Frank Aydelotte, of Swarthmore, who presided:

(1) Are the methods of Honors work applicable to the secondary school?

(2) What type of secondary school training is best calculated to develop the qualities of independence, initiative and intellectual curiosity required for success in Honors work in college?

(3) Is it feasible for the best students to cover in the secondary school, without extension of time, the ground covered by college placement examinations for freshman exemption?

An affirmative answer to the first question as to applicability was given by representatives of schools where the Honors plan or its equivalent is in use. Among these were Head Master Mather A. Abbott and Dean F. J. V. Hancox,

of the Lawrenceville School; Head Master Richard M. Gummere, of the William Penn Charter School; Principal George A. Walton, of the George School; Principals James Walker and Carrol Brown, of Westtown School; Vice-Principal Earle Leslie Hunter, of Friends Seminary, New York City; Principal Lucy L. W. Wilson and Miss Ruth Wanger, of the South Philadelphia High School for Girls. A number of these statements as to the success of Honors classes in schools carried with them replies to questions (2) and (3) of the program.*

The main addresses of the conference were delivered by President Aydelotte; by Dr. Abraham Flexner, for many years Secretary of the General Education Board; and Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, novelist and publicist. Mr. Philip Kerr, Secretary of the Rhodes Trust, also spoke.

President Aydelotte sketched the growth of Honors work in American collegiate education (about 100 institutions are now offering some form of Honors instruction) and he touched upon the development at Swarthmore College where such work was begun in 1922. "Instead of making any revolutionary program, we started with a few individuals, to see what we could do with them." President Aydelotte advised experiment by the schools on the same basis.

Taking the field of medicine as a parallel, Dr. Flexner in his address suggested that education might profitably employ medical methods of research. "Forget the number involved and devote attention to finding a way of dealing with each of your problems. Once the way is found, application on a large scale is not difficult. If we can make some contribution to the qualitative aspect, ultimately the quantitative aspect of our educational problems will be solved." Dr. Flexner cited how "Johns Hopkins University did its great work with a small group" and how "Swarthmore is accomplishing great things with a limited number of juniors and seniors reading for Honors." The speaker

* See notes at conclusion of this paper.

declared that the college period is too short to do what could and should be done and that the high school period ought to be included in the training of real intellectual powers. He told of his own experience, as a young man, in teaching Greek and other subjects to boys preparing for college. "It is perfectly feasible, in my judgment, to take ordinary pupils and do with them quite unusual things." Honors methods, instead of being undemocratic, constitute, Dr. Flexner said, "the essence of democracy in discovering and developing leaders of superior talent by whose leadership the general public will profit."

Mrs. Fisher opened her address with a reference to her interest as a parent in Honors reading, her daughter being an Honors student at Swarthmore. "This work offers a chance of forming civilized habits of mind, so that it will seem really just as natural for our children to go on trying to improve their intellectual education as to improve their stroke in tennis." There ought to be in this country, Mrs. Fisher maintained, a goodly company of citizens who will lead an actually intellectual life, thus helping to energize our democracy.

A Round Table Conference of School and College Administrators on Scholarly Standards

"How can we improve genuine scholarship in college preparation?" was the subject of a round table conference of about 200 school and college administrators and teachers, held December 1, 1928, at Atlantic City, as a part of the annual convention of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. Replies to the question were given in three addresses by Head Master Wilson Farrand, of the Newark Academy, by Dean Radcliffe Heermance, of Princeton University, and by Head Master C. C. Tillinghast, of the Horace Mann School for Boys.

The reply of Dr. Farrand advocated support of the College Entrance Examination Board, which he regarded as

affording "the most striking example of educational cooperation that this country has yet seen." The Board is entitled to "high credit for assembling each year groups of representative college and school teachers who act together in framing requirements, in preparing papers, and in judging results." Dr. Farrand declared that the Board is performing a most valuable service in raising the scholarly and intellectual level in this country by "proclaiming and maintaining standards of attainment in the work of our secondary schools and standards of admission to our colleges."

One of the replies to the question given by Dean Heermance in his talk was for colleges to "make such changes in their admission requirements and their freshman curriculum as would lighten the drudgery of the really high type of student and enable him to be introduced more quickly to the college courses that will present him our greatest challenge. We hope, at Princeton, to readjust somewhat our freshman required courses and to allow our outstanding freshmen the opportunity to elect one or perhaps two sophomore courses." In the discussion which followed it was brought out by Professor Adam Leroy Jones that Columbia opens advanced courses to freshmen who prove superior preparation. Dean Walters reported that Swarthmore now exempts from the regular freshman courses in English, foreign languages and mathematics those entering students who demonstrate in their placement tests that they are qualified for advanced courses. Reference was made to similar arrangements at Harvard and at the University of Buffalo.

Dean Heermance gave statistics showing that at Princeton all of the first-group men in the freshman class (1927–28) and thirty-seven out of forty-two second-group men had ranked in the upper seventh of their graduating classes in secondary schools. The experience at Princeton should lead, Dean Heermance thought, to "the elimination by schools of their lowest quarter men so far as college preparatory work is concerned."

Dr. Karl G. Miller, Director of Admissions at the University of Pennsylvania, made public a study of college records at Pennsylvania (first semester, freshman year) which showed that "70 per cent of the highest quarter of the college class had ranked in the highest quarter of the high school class, while 21 per cent ranked in the second quarter, 8 per cent in the third quarter, and 1 per cent in the lowest quarter."

Harvard figures, supplied by Henry Pennypacker, Chairman of Admissions, were read by Head Master Warren, who presided at this conference. They indicated that

> Men who enter Harvard from public schools do better work in their studies than men from private schools, or from the so-called tutoring schools, during the freshman year. . . . Of the 436 who entered from public schools (class of 1929), 102 obtained ranks which gave them places on the Dean's List, and sixty had unsatisfactory records; of the 411 men from private schools, fifty-three were put on the Dean's List and ninety-two had unsatisfactory records. . . . Of the forty-eight men who last year (1927–28) entered the freshman class from tutoring schools, two were on the Dean's List, twenty made unsatisfactory records, and twelve had their connection with the college severed.

The third formal speaker, Head Master Tillinghast, outlined the Honors work being done at the Horace Mann School for Boys:

> For some time at the Horace Mann School for Boys, one of the three schools of Teachers College of Columbia University, classes have been graded in sections according to ability, and a special attempt has been made to discover ways of making more valuable to the individuals of greater ability the work offered in the so-called advanced sections. Several plans have been tried. The two most important ones are—first, the doing of four years work in three, or three years work in two; and second, the giving of the opportunity to boys of unusual ability, who show special aptitudes in any given field, to carry on Honors work in those

fields. This has been tried with apparently considerable success, as well as enjoyment to many individual boys, in English, Latin, modern language, and science. It has frequently happened that two plans combine in the following way. Several boys in the class which was graduated in June, 1928, had been members of fast moving sections and were, at the end of their junior year, practically ready for college admission, inasmuch as they had been in sections which had done four years work in three.

These boys were given opportunity to do Honors work in fields of their choice, and as a matter of fact such work was done mainly in the fields of English and science. At the present time we are placing our greatest emphasis on Honors work in the field of English literature, and we have approximately twenty boys out of a class of seventy-five who are being given the opportunity of reading, under supervision, to their hearts' content.

Although this plan of Honors work is, with us, by no means complete or in a final form, we are convinced that it is a positive step in the right direction in our attempts to increase scholarship and love for learning on the part of the brighter boys. The matter of the technique involved is rather largely left to the judgment of the individual departments, but we are agreed on the desirability of the general procedure.

College Selection a Year Before Admission

At a meeting of the Head Masters' Association in February, 1928, N. Horton Batchelder, Head Master of the Loomis Institute, presented a study of "The Rising Tide of Applicants for College," which included this proposal:

> At the end of the junior year the candidate would submit school records, personal references, the scholastic aptitude test of the College Board, and (if the college does not accept certificates) College Board examinations on the work of the junior year. If the candidate is acceptable he is promised admission if, in the senior year, he takes studies approved by the college, is certified by his school, and receives his honorable dismissal.

This plan has possibilities as an admission device but even greater interest for the freedom it might give the private schools to pay less attention in the last year to drill for entrance examinations and more attention to the intellectual reading and development of their seniors. Mr. Batchelder reported an encouraging response from colleges to which he wrote about the proposal.

A similar project was brought before the College Entrance Examination Board by a member at a Board meeting in April, 1927. Action resulted by which candidates for college may now take the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the Board at the end of their junior year at school.

Cooperation of Women's Colleges and Girls' Schools

Participating as they do with men's colleges and coeducational institutions in regional and national associations, the women's colleges have in addition been active recently in their relations with girls' schools. This is done in part through a standing committee of the National Association of Schools for Girls and representatives of the admission committees of the various colleges for women. At the annual meeting of the Association it is the practice to set aside one session for a joint school and college conference when questions of intellectual advance are discussed.

The attitude of the women's colleges is expressed by Dean C. Mildred Thompson, of Vassar, as follows:

> In our admission methods more and more emphasis is placed upon the intellectual quality of the candidate and less emphasis upon the completion of precisely defined material in designated subjects. . . . It is possible in many colleges, I am sure, for a student who has special gifts in one subject or special opportunities to study beyond the ordinary confines of the school program, to proceed in this field and to have strength in that one subject as a great asset in securing admission to college.

Action on the English Comprehensive Examination

Historically, comprehensive examinations are important because their establishment by the College Entrance Ex-

amination Board in 1915 brought to the board the cooperation of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar and Wellesley.

From the view-point of this report comprehensive examinations are significant because they are planned to test intellectual grasp rather than specific skill.

The College Board's comprehensive examination in English was recently the subject of a lively controversy between certain English groups. The National Committee on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English prepared a new definition of the English comprehensive examination in which questions in grammar were included. This action was opposed by many schools and colleges, and with particular vigor by the School and College Conference on English, an organization of women's colleges and schools for girls. The outcome was that grammar questions were omitted in the National Committee's definition adopted by the College Board in November, 1928.

Phi Beta Kappa and Other Scholarship Awards

The establishing of annual prizes for merit in scholarship was planned by the Phi Beta Kappa Society as a part of the celebration in December, 1926, of the society's one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Although this has not been carried through on the scale projected, various chapters throughout the country are making awards for scholarship in secondary schools, both public and private. The purpose of Phi Beta Kappa in this enterprise is, in the words of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., a member of the senate of the society, to summon to the aid of scholarship and teaching "all who value learning, all who believe in the life of the spirit."

Among college awards that relate to schools may be cited the prizes of cups presented each year by Bates and by Bowdoin to the high schools whose graduates attain the highest scholastic rank in the first semester of the freshman year.

Psychological Tests and College Achievement

With the development of scientific methods in education, schools and colleges have come to utilize at least one of these methods as supplementary to their content examinations and school records. Psychological tests are now very widely used. Without claiming that their tests really *measure* general intelligence or general mental ability, the psychologists do maintain that "high scores in such tests usually indicate ability to do a high order of scholastic work."

The high predictive value of the Thorndike Test was shown in an investigation by Dr. Ben D. Wood of the records of Columbia College students, 1919–21, and of Phi Beta Kappa elections at Columbia for several years. It should be added, however, that Dean Herbert E. Hawkes has reported that the seniors at Columbia elected to Phi Beta Kappa in 1928 averaged only slightly above the general average of their class in Thorndike Test scores.

Recent favorable evidence is supplied in the report of Professor Carl C. Brigham, of Princeton, Chairman of the College Board Commission on the Scholastic Aptitude Test, dealing with the freshman performance of 356 college students, 1927–28. The upper 31 per cent of this class scholastically included 75 per cent of those who made grade *A* in the scholastic aptitude test; 48.5 per cent of those who made grade *B* in the test; and 25 per cent of those who made *C* in the test.

The Minnesota Colleges and High School Seniors

After a successful beginning in 1928, the Association of Minnesota Colleges is planning this year an extension of its activities that will reach every high school in the state. The purpose is given as the stimulation of the high schools and pre-college guidance of students. Regarding the project last year Sister Antonia, Dean of the College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, reports as follows:

The work was directed from the office of Dean J. B. Johnston, of the University of Minnesota. College ability tests, tests in reading, in English literature and in the mechanics of English were given at several centers throughout the state. High school seniors were invited to come to these centers to take the tests. A large number were tested in this way in May. During the summer the Minnesota colleges received ratings of all these pupils. Fifty boys and girls rating very high, being younger than the others and in some cases in greater need, received scholarships at any of the colleges they chose. To all the pupils who took the tests Dean Johnston wrote, telling them the significance of their ratings. Letters of interpretation were addressed to the parents also.

General Tests of Educational Achievement

All of the public high schools of Pennsylvania and forty-nine colleges of the state cooperated in giving, in May, 1928, general tests of educational achievement to their senior classes, including forty thousand high school and four thousand four hundred college students. These were tests of the so-called new type. The purpose was to learn what the education of these students "amounts to in terms *first* of clear, available, important ideas, and *second* of ability to discriminate exactly among ideas and to use them accurately in thinking." The tests were conducted and the study of their results is being made by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in cooperation with the Joint Commission of the Association of Pennsylvania College Presidents and the State Department of Public Instruction.

The Work of the Progressive Schools

During the past decade the work of the "Progressive Schools" has attained an important place in American education. The movement is too well known to need chronicling here. Its advocates maintain that progressive

methods lead to a raising of intellectual standards in the broad sense of this term.

The Progressive Education Association, which is to hold its ninth annual convention at St. Louis next month, has announced the first institute of instruction in the principles and practices of progressive education, to be conducted July 1 to 19 at the Pennsylvania State College.

Part III—A Look Ahead

What about intellectual standards in the future?

Well, there are several aspects of this review of the past and of the present which bear rich promise.

Schools and colleges are now upon a friendly basis of cooperation in the realization that education is not a disjointed but a continuous process, in which the terms lower and higher should carry no tinge of inferiority or superiority.

In the new methods of work among secondary schools which have been recounted, there appear to be real possibilities for an intellectual future. Fulfillment of these possibilities will depend in large measure on cooperation by the colleges in recognizing such work, in testing for a qualitative as well as a quantitative standard, in giving scope to students of higher powers and ambition.

There should be an understanding that, as Professor Arthur Quiller-Couch has pointed out, the grace of a liberal education is not a thing of "stations in life" and that Humanism is, or should be, "no decorative appendage, purchased late in the process of education within the means of a few, but a quality, rather, which should and can condition all teaching."

Cooperating upon principles such as these, our schools and colleges may help to make our American democracy a dwelling place for the higher life of man.

Brief Reports on Honors Courses in Secondary Schools

Lawrenceville School

Without using the name "Honors" classes, Lawrenceville offers its more capable pupils advanced work of two kinds.

First, many boys whose formal college entrance requirements are nearly or altogether completed are encouraged to occupy themselves with advanced work in the subjects in which they are most interested. The instruction generally takes the form of individual guidance. Specifically, this sort of work was carried on last year by about thirty-five boys, in Advanced English, Latin, French, and mathematics. In most cases the actual accomplishment was roughly equivalent to the freshman courses in college, with variations according to the personal interest of the pupil. In most cases also the instruction was given by men who have had experience in college teaching.

Second, the work done in most of the A-Track classes, especially among the boys who are to be graduated, might be called Honors work. Here, however, the extension of the required college entrance subjects is horizontal rather than vertical. The effort is not so much to push ahead into the subject-matter of the following year as it is to widen and deepen the required work. In English, for example, a great deal of reading and some writing is done in the type of literature that is being studied in preparation for the College Board examinations; in Latin the boys do large quantities of sight work; and in mathematics, large number of "originals," especially those which have to do with what are usually called practical matters. It is interesting to note that, although such an arrangement of work involves a great deal more activity on the boy's part than would be necessary for College Board preparation, yet there seems to be no dissatisfaction with the arrangement. Of course, here as in every department of education, the great compensating factor is the boy's absorbing interest in something that he can do well and that he enjoys doing.—*Mather A. Abbott.*

William Penn Charter School

There seem to be three reasons for giving attention to some sort of Honors work, or at least to the matter of raising the maturity-level of subjects studied in the last three years of secondary schools. One reason is to cut out deadwood in answer to the demands of a long professional training or the responsibilities put on the school by the Junior Colleges. Another, and perhaps the most important, is to establish in the school more of the joy of research and learning, and to regard the boy less as "brain-fodder" for college than as a discoverer. The third is to provide such thoroughness in training as may lead to advanced standing in college, and solider knowledge of the subject.

The trend in the upper classes of The William Penn Charter School is towards the selection of properly qualified boys who can, in one section of each class, indulge in one or more of these fields. Four-fifths

of the seniors who take advanced (college) algebra, are there voluntarily, because of interest in the subject; a half-dozen now in the third-year high grade and fifteen of the seniors, have passed C. E. E. B. Comprehensive English, and are doing special reading, or writing for the school magazine; a group from the three older classes is reading Egbert's *Latin Inscriptions* and a simple book on Roman archeology; individuals during the past four years, in chemistry (second-year), French and Latin of freshman calibre, are continually being given permission to venture ahead with a separate conference in the company of the teacher. Doctor Davison's new music course and a general year of economics have proved to be of value in widening the breadth of the seventeen-year-old boy.

It is in this way, it seems to us, that the intellectual progress of secondary education lies; and we welcome cooperation with the honors work of the colleges.—*Richard Mott Gummere.*

South Philadelphia High School for Girls

In February, 1926, inspired by Swarthmore, an Honors group of the graduating class was elected by the faculty on the basis of scholarship and ability (about seven per cent). They were given freedom to make their own time-tables and encouraged, but not compelled, to accept the elective work already offered in many subjects. They reported on the advantages of this freedom as follows: a saving of school time from forty-five minutes to seven hours weekly (medium, three and three quarters hours), used for an interesting variety of purposes.

The next term, the new group of Honors students were offered the opportunity to work together with four teachers (three department heads and the principal) on a project involving history and science (reported in *The Survey*, April, 1927). This was accepted by a third of the group, the rest prefering to devote the time to the better mastery of curricular subjects, or, perhaps, to greater leisure!

Now-a-days, any one of the honors group (juniors and seniors) may read for Honors in any subject. Graduation with Honors means the successful completion of this work, together with a general average of 90. Acceptance of the obligation of Honors is almost universal.

Obviously, we have only scratched the surface of the possibilities of Honors work in a high school. Our next step will be to attack the second year, insisting there on a better mastery of tool subjects, as a preliminary to the opportunity for Honors work in the third and fourth years.—*Lucy L. W. Wilson.*

George School

There is no way to make an accurate quantitative estimate of the influence on secondary schools of the new method of college work

known by such terms as "reading for Honors" or "independent study." The influence, nevertheless, is very real. It describes an ideal of accomplishment; it reveals an approach to learning to which teachers in English, history, and mathematics have been quick to respond. The exact form of the response varies to a large degree and ought not to be hardened into a system.

In general, limited fields of study are laid before the pupils for exploration and accomplishment. The teacher, after a few directions, says, "Go ahead; get what you can. Then report." Originals in geometry, written problems in algebra, individual classics in English, such as *Hamlet*, are the favorite fields for the independent approach. In the history courses, the method is used more continuously. Students generally attend their regular class periods, working independently under the teacher's supervision and sometimes with his assistance. It is permissible, however, for students to do their work entirely outside the classrooms. Discussion periods are not programmed but spring up spontaneously. This method requires a teacher of much scholarship and teaching skill.

Another variation is found in the division of algebra or English classes into groups, setting free one group for continuous independent study. These students may be excused from attending class sessions, but it generally works out that they attend and pursue their studies independently. Conscientious regular reports to the teachers are an essential part of such a method. In some classes, the independent study group has been as small as one.

One advanced class in English works throughout the year upon an extensive course of reading, meeting once a week regularly for discussion and report. A review class covers algebra and plane geometry by substantially the same plan.

In no case are pupils compelled to rely solely upon the independent method. If a student cannot solve an original problem in geometry, the teacher will tell him how to do it. After several weeks of independent labor in United States history, the teacher will spend a Saturday morning in voluntary conference, to teach the pupils the relative importance of the facts studied, and the connections of cause and effect. In the advanced twelfth grade English class, a pupil who cannot or will not work independently is transferred. The proportion of pupils who use these opportunities is not large, but, as it includes the ablest and most ambitious, it seems justified.

The school marking system has been adjusted to recognize results achieved independently by giving a special meaning to the symbol "A": "These students have mastered all the requirements, proving that they are self-dependent and interested in intellectual things. They are also conscientious, thorough, and serious in purpose."

A paragraph is published in the "Program of Studies," headed "Independent Study," as follows: "Students who would profit by working faster than the class and by covering more ground may study independently under their teacher's direction. The Principal's approval is necessary in each case. The same credit is allowed as for a course completed in the ordinary way, but the ambition, ability, and self-dependence of such pupils justifies a higher recommendation for college entrance."—*George A. Walton.*

Westtown School

High scholarship is recognized by the publication of an Honor Roll each two weeks, by special privileges as regards place and time of study, by extra opportunities to leave the school, and by membership in the Cum Laude Society.

Every department tries to "lead out" its best pupils, but our English Department seems to be able to do most in this direction. Beyond the minimum requirement senior pupils are encouraged to pursue a course in voluntary reading. Bibliographies are supplied and a certain amount of time is allowed. We have been pleasantly surprised at what the boys and girls accomplish under this plan.

For the past two years we have offered an advanced course in composition for those showing special aptitude in this direction.—*James F. Walker.*

Friends Seminary, New York City

In several of the departments of Friends Seminary, where college entrance requirements are less rigid, efforts have been made to provide for gifted students a stimulus of more mature and independent work.

The work in English is assigned in such a way that there is ample opportunity for additional work on the part of those interested in doing more than the minimum requirement. There is much extra reading of literature and group discussions of it so as to build up critical appreciation and, where possible, independent of literary standards.

In history, emphasis is placed upon the individual student's program and achievement by introducing the problem unit whereby the classroom becomes a library and the teacher's interest is in habits of study. Competent students thus have the opportunity and are encouraged to undertake more extended study in some historical subject. No special text is used.

In the senior class, discussions in Social Problems are conducted with reference to some of the most pressing current issues. No special text is used. The class work is in the form of discussions on the

basis of references to a number of books borrowed from the libraries. Students undertake the study of a problem that especially interests them and organize and lead the class discussions of the issues involved.

A small voluntary group, from six to eight (last year, and this), meets weekly for a discussion of philosophical problems. Selections from the leading philosophers are read. The impulse for this came from several students last year and the interest in the work and the depth of the discussions have fully warranted the undertaking.

In the Department of Mathematics, assignments of minimum and maximum requirements are made in such a way that the more interested and capable students often do at least twice the work of the average student.

The whole purpose of the above program of the school in its deviation from the conventional type of teaching is to enable the student the better to swim academically and intellectually after leaving this school whether or not he may go into college. Those who go on to college find their college work much easier as a result.—*Henry L. Messner.*

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE has met with a most favorable reception from members of the Association and the general public. The book is sold at $2.00 per copy; library discount, ten per cent. See pages 72 and 98.

Dr. John H. Finley, Editor of *The New York Times:* "I wish I could have had such a book when I was beginning work as a college president."

Two leaders alert to literature on college problems:

"I was wakeful the other night when I should have been asleep and thought to induce slumber by reading THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE. It did not work that way. It waked me up to my depths. I consider it a most valuable collection of educational wisdom, and hope its circulation may include all college executives especially."

"THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE I read this summer with increasing interest and much appreciation. The problems and opportunities of our colleges are presented in striking fashion. It is a book that men in college work must needs read."

Orders should be sent to the *Association of American Colleges, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City.*

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

*A Summary**

PRESIDENT CLARENCE C. LITTLE
University of Michigan, Chairman

The trend which has characterized educational development during the past five or six years has now become a definite current. It is leading in the direction of decentralization of authority. It is forcing us to regard education as a cooperative venture. Roughly speaking, the teacher is the producer and the student the consumer. As in most other fields of human activity, the rights and opinions of the consumer are coming to be more and more important. It is obvious that this can be accomplished in two main ways: first, by impressing the teacher with the fact that he must consider the way in which his teaching is received; and, second, by impressing upon the student that he is an actual constructive force in the educational process and, as such, owes unselfish thought and effort to the advancement of truth.

Progress in the first of these lines may be furthered by recognition and promotion on the basis of teaching ability to a far greater extent than is at present common; by organization of the four-year curriculum in such a way as to emphasize the need of a progressive change in student attitude throughout its course; by the appointment and encouragement of individuals and agencies for the detection and solution of personnel problems, both in the faculty and in the student body.

* President Little has furnished this summary of the report for his Commission. The report was not presented at Chattanooga, owing to the fact that the Chairman was unavoidably detained at the last moment, and no other member was able to be present.—*The Editor.*

The second problem can be approached by forcing upon the students more active participation in the educational policies of the institution as a legitimate "outside activity"; by recognizing individuality, initiative and imagination where those qualities occur, either in individuals or organizations of students; and by discussing frankly with students the unsolved problems which will make clear to them the fact that the faculty and administration, as well as they themselves, are learning daily as well as teaching.

We are growing up as a nation and the time is coming near when we can say to students: "Come to college and get all you can. Here are students who have been touched with the divine fire of the love of knowledge. They are typical learners and are called professors. Come and associate with them and see if you can catch from them any of their technique and enthusiasm. Discussion is the only valid form of examination. Discovery of new wisdom is the only academic reward."

I was greatly delighted in reading that wise old German educator, Jean Paul Richter, to find that he kept a book in which he noted not the mistakes but every semblance of an original idea evolved by any member of his class. . . . Now, if the meditative ideals of education ever become possible, this portfolio of ideas will come to be the standard in every classroom. When prospective employers ask for information about students the professor, instead of saying he is a Bachelor of Arts, will turn to his file and say: "Here is a poem he wrote! Here is an original solution for a geometric problem. Here is an appraisal of the Napoleonic era. These things will give you some idea of the quality of his mind." Of course, you will say, before this happens the world as well as the college will have to be changed. True, and the function of the college is to change the world. —*J. Edgar Park, Wheaton College.*

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ATHLETICS

PROFESSOR BERT E. YOUNG
Indiana University, Chairman

The Association has had some comprehensive and practical reports on college athletics from such leaders as Dean Nicolson, Dr. Sanford, Dean Anderson and others. The subject has been covered from all angles, and in the conservative spirit of men who have been long in the business and who knew whereof they spoke. When, therefore, I was made Chairman of this Commission, probably because of some historical connection with the movement for better athletic conditions in the Southern colleges, I found that there was little that I could do beyond recalling the earlier reports, and advocating some action at the present meeting. I felt that the matter ought at least to be brought to the front annually until some definite formulation of regulations could be brought about.

Meanwhile a considerable activity has appeared in some of the associations and athletic conferences. At its last meeting the North Central Association adopted the report of the Committee on Athletics to its Commission on Higher Education, embodying a standard of athletic principles to apply to the colleges belonging to the North Central Association. Since it is a new move for the North Central Association to enter the field of athletics, this may be said to be a most momentous action. In the spring of 1928 the Minnesota Athletic Conference adopted the North Central regulation.

The directors of the Western Intercollegiate Conference at Chicago, December 7, gave their formal indorsement to the requirements of the North Central Association. The Midwest Conference and the Illinois Athletic Conference

adopted resolutions using those of the "Big Ten" as a model, and the Southern College Association has similar rules under way.

The Southern Conference on Athletics held at Nashville during the week of December 9 heard a notable address by Chancellor Kirkland urging the Conference to enlarge the scope of its activities and cooperate to the fullest extent with the associations of colleges and universities. It was an impassioned appeal for the coordination of all agencies in the fostering of proper athletic ideals and in the correction of outstanding evils. This address was widely quoted and commended.

In addition, the National Collegiate Athletic Association which has always taken a high stand, at its meeting in New Orleans during the week of December 25, expressed appreciation of the step taken by the North Central Association and urged similar action by corresponding associations in other parts of the country.

Let us review carefully the procedure of the North Central Association. In March, 1927, the Committee on Athletics made a preliminary report with five articles making suggestions as to possible methods of establishing athletic standards for the North Central Association institutions of higher education.

The Association voted to instruct the Committee to send copies of this preliminary report to all member institutions for criticism, suggestions and individual approval or disapproval.

Only twenty-one institutions responded at first with suggestions. This appeared to be too small a percentage to be representative of the 251 member institutions. So in January, 1928, a second copy of the report was sent to each institution, accompanied by a tabulated statement of the reports from the twenty-one members which had replied to the first communication. To this eighty-seven additional replies were received, so that they had all together replies from 108 institutions representing universities, colleges,

teachers' training colleges, and junior colleges. Not one of the 108 answers expressed any real dissatisfaction with the nature of the report as a whole. Six, while expressing themselves as profoundly in sympathy with the standards suggested, doubted whether an adoption of these standards by the North Central Association would really contribute effectively to any needed changes. Several of the replies came from colleges for women which preferred to refrain from any definite statement of attitude on a matter which would not immediately concern them. With these exceptions the entire list of 108 approved the general content of the report. Ten institutions advocated the article requiring membership in an accredited athletic conference as being all that was necessary in the way of a North Central Athletic standard. However, about the same number objected to this same article being made a standard. Forty-six institutions voiced a demand for the article stating the principles involved which I shall read later.

Your Chairman submitted to all the members of the Commission on College Athletics of the Association a proposal for a regulation embodying a set of rules providing the best elements in all the regulations of the various associations, and they gave their hearty approval. We have had a wide correspondence with all these bodies. In the end we got together on the new official rules of the North Central Association. We believe that they are sufficient and represent the best thought on this matter. Furthermore, they have the advantage of having been adopted practically without change by a number of important bodies and we believe that all the associations and conferences of the United States can get together on them. We present, therefore, for your consideration and recommend for adoption two provisions, which are identical with those adopted by the North Central Association as their Articles 3 and 4, Articles 1 and 2 being general statements of their object.

Regulation on College Athletics

Article I (Identical with *Article III* of the North Central Association)

That a list of accredited athletic conferences be drawn up by this commission, and any member institution maintaining a membership in good standing in any one or more of these accredited athletic conferences be considered without further action to be maintaining approved athletic standards.

Article II (Identical with *Article IV* of the North Central Association)

That in the case of member institutions that do not maintain membership in good standing in such an accredited athletic conference, the following standard of athletic principles be adopted as determining the basis of accrediting.

(1) Final decision in all matters of athletic policy shall rest with the faculty or with administrative officers representing the faculty.

(2) Academic requirements and assignments of scholarships, student aid funds and remunerative employment for students, shall be immediately and finally controlled by the faculty, acting directly or through its regularly constituted officers or committees, without discrimination either in favor of or against athletics.

(3) Payments of money to students for services as athletes, hiring athletes or the equivalent of such procedure, and maintenance of free training tables are not permissible.

(4) Personal solicitation of prospective students by athletic coaches through the offering of any such special inducements as are indicated in Sec. (3) above is not permissible.

(5) Coaches should be regularly constituted members of the faculty, fully responsible to the administration.

(6) Faculties should control and keep within reasonable limits the amount of time devoted to athletics. This refers to hours of daily practice as well as to the number of contests and length of trips, or any other athletic requirement which detracts from academic efficiency.

(7) Athletic conditions should be normal and stabilized and tenure of office on approximately the same basis as in other departments, and, where this is the case, salaries of coaches should be commensurate with salaries paid to men of equal rank in other departments, and should be paid directly by the institution.

(8) All athletic funds shall be either regularly audited by or directly handled and disbursed by the institution's business office. All athletic expenditures should be included in the institution's budget.

This Association, which represents a choice of the acceptable colleges of America, needs to go farther than any other body toward elevating the tone of American institutions. It should set the lead by adopting a regulation to raise the ideals of college athletics. Your Commission proposes, therefore, the enactment of a standard of the following purport:

Article III

The acceptable college encourages high-class athletics as an ally of educational efforts, with a proper place in the curriculum and in harmony with the purposes of higher education. This Association stands against such abuses as commercialism, professionalism and sensational exploitation of college teams by promoters within or without the college. The tone of athletics must be in harmony with the general tone required of a member institution. The management and control of the athletics of an institution should be vested in a small, effective and responsible body chosen from the chief administrative officers, especially the president, the deans and the athletic committee with the free support of the trustees. These provisions are conditions of membership in the Association of American Colleges.

Your Commission is a body of optimists, not pessimists. We have all been in touch with athletics most of our lives. We believe that the enormous interest of the public in athletic contests of the present day is not in itself an unhealthy sign. It is due in part to the popularization of education, to the publicity bureaus of the colleges, to the

widespread organization of alumni, to improved transportation, better roads, and greater wealth and leisure.

In some places, right now, we can still see some very unhealthy developments. Your Chairman is well acquainted with an institution where the athletic interests were farmed out, just the other day, to a group of local business men who expect to use the proceeds of their exploitation to pay for an excessively large and expensive stadium. This might have been prevented by a strong provision against commercialism and exploitation.

We believe that there has been a steady growth of public sentiment against the abuses of athletics, and we believe that it is possible for the governing associations and the authorities of the colleges to regain the complete management and control which in some cases they have allowed to slip too far out of their grasp. The authorities of the smaller institutions, confronted with the competition of the larger, and with an insistent demand from alumni and from the public for success on the field, are especially in need of *an effective means of resistance.* We favor, therefore, a definite, positive and united stand for effective rules and regulations by all the college associations and athletic conferences of the country.

DISCUSSION*

President B. I. Bell (St. Stephen's College) said:

> With the tone and purpose of these resolutions no decent educator can be in disagreement, but with certain specific things I find myself—and I know I speak as representing my institution—definitely in disagreement.

Dr. Bell objected, however, to the provision making athletic coaches members of the faculty, to the provision that scholarship funds shall be assigned by the faculty, and

* EDITOR'S NOTE: A long and animated discussion followed this report. A number of excerpts are given which will explain the final vote. These are taken *verbatim* from the report of the official stenographer of the meeting.

to the adoption of the regulation as a standard for membership in the Association of American Colleges.

President W. J. Martin (Davidson College) spoke in favor of adoption.

President H. M. Gage (Coe College) spoke as follows:

I am going to speak to you just a moment by request of Professor Young because it happened that I was persuaded to serve as the chairman of the committee of the North Central Association which worked for three years in drawing up these standards and finally getting them adopted last March in Chicago at the meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

I first consented to serve as the chairman of this special committee on athletics because the Association, or the Executive Committee at the time promised me that I could do my work through coöperation with other agencies. At that time I thought I saw a way of escape, and it was suggested that we could get all our material by coöperating with the Carnegie Foundation in getting out the report on which Dr. Savage has been working. And being an accrediting agency with academic standards we thought we might first work with Dr. Savage on the business of answering a frequently repeated question: Are athletes academically a favored class of students? That was about all that we intended to do. We intended to open the records of the North Central Association and the Registrars' offices of North Central institutions to the investigators sent out by the Carnegie Foundation.

There were certain rapidly changing conditions brought to the attention of the Association which forced action and forced it rather speedily. We were compelled by reason of that fact to take definite action on certain institutions, to say in one or two cases that we would not admit an institution on account of its athletic policy and that in spite of the fact that we had no standard other than "tone and atmosphere" by which to exclude them.

It then came about that I was asked to draw up a list of standards which I did simply by drawing on a general fund of knowledge and by reading all available standards. Finally we sent out for approval the

standards that Professor Young has presented to you this evening. These standards after being considered for a year were adopted last March by the North Central.

I could speak to you a very long time unburdening not so much my mind as unburdening my heart with regard to this whole situation. So I am very frankly going to make an appeal to you, as I have, at a great sacrifice of time and by much traveling, made a very direct personal appeal to a number of athletic associations. I started first with the Western Conference, the Big Ten in Chicago, and have visited as many athletic associations as I could.

I am not going to ask you to adopt these standards. I am going to ask you to give very careful consideration to the point that was raised by President Bell, not that point that he raised about coaches being members of the faculty because I do not think that point is a good point. But you ought to give a good deal of attention to the other point he made with regard to this Association going into the business of setting up standards and setting up machinery for enforcement. I do not think it possible or wise to do that.

Now my request to you. I want to ask this body of men and women here to give a very tender consideration to the report of this committee. It is possible for you, with the wit that you have, to enter into meticulous argumentation and debate and prove the impossibility of these standards.

I am just asking you not to do that, for this is a little attempt, it is a sincere attempt and, mark you, is is a very serious attempt to do something to make athletics better than they are. I should very much regret to see any debate or any resolution that would weaken that set of standards in any sense so that this little movement might die a-borning. I do not think we can enforce these standards in this Association. But I do not want to take them back to the North Central next March marked by the disapproval of the Association of American Colleges.

President J. W. Provine (Mississippi College), a member of the Commission on College Athletics and President of the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association, spoke in favor of adoption.

President A. B. Storms (Baldwin-Wallace College) moved the adoption of the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, That we as an Association heartily approve the efforts of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to establish athletic standards and we approve the standards as already adopted by that Association.

President G. E. Snavely (Birmingham-Southern College) spoke as follows:

> I will second that motion. I am secretary of the Southern College Association and we have a regulation in our Association that is practically identical with this, so I think it would be better to amend the motion that this Association go on record as being heartily in sympathy with the ideals expressed in these resolutions of this Commission. That doesn't give any special credit to the North Central or any other special regional standardizing agency, because there are possibly the Middle States and Maryland, and other associations that have these same ideals. I know we have passed them in the Southern Association.

After some further discussion, Dr. Snavely, at the request of President Arnett, restated the motion as follows:

> As a substitute motion we move that the Association of American Colleges gives hearty approval to the ideals expressed in the report of the Commission on Athletics.

President D. L. Marsh (Boston University) offered as a substitute for all that had gone before a motion to adopt Article III, eliminating the second part of the first sentence ("with a proper place in the curriculum and in harmony with the purposes of higher education"). This motion was lost, and after some further discussion President Arnett recalled the body to the consideration of the substitute motion of Dr. Snavely, which was carried, and the Association passed to the next item on the program.

The discussion showed a general sympathy with the regulation, with, however, a feeling that the traditional policy of the Association was against the adoption of any standards and regulations.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS

MR. RAYMOND N. BALL
Treasurer, University of Rochester

The Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, of which Mr. Trevor Arnett is Chairman, was appointed two years ago, and has had several meetings at which the problems, with which the Commission assumes it should deal, have been discussed at length. These problems can be briefly stated as follows:

a. How can this Commission be of assistance to colleges in dealing with the financial problems, particularly those problems which are involved in the handling of permanent funds?
b. How best can the Association make an effort to enlist the cooperation of helpful agencies such as trust companies, insurance companies and lawyers, in assisting to provide for additional permanent funds?

The interest in the first problem is apparent. Capital wisely handled attracts additional capital. The business of education has become a big business and is so recognized. Between the period 1922–1924, the endowment of institutions of higher learning was increased $115,505,361, totalling approximately $815,000,000. This increase added to the resources 65 per cent of the total sum which these institutions had amassed from the time of the discovery of America by Columbus to the year 1900. However, of the 769 privately endowed institutions in 1924 only thirteen possessed $10,000,000 or more each; 114 possessed one to ten million and 642 less than one million. We have a long way to go yet before the great majority of our educational institutions are on a firm basis.

As the business interests of colleges and universities have grown, old business systems have been discarded and

new adopted. No longer does the board of trustees take pride in the annual deficit, for it recognizes that this is not a forceful appeal to the generous friend. There has been great improvement in the business administration of our educational institutions and as a result many of our colleges and universities are as well operated today as many of our large industrial corporations, Professor Munro, of Harvard and of *Atlantic Monthly* fame, notwithstanding. For this accomplishment no little credit is due to the book by Mr. Trevor Arnett, *College and University Finance*, published by the General Education Board, which has served as a guide to hundreds of colleges and universities all over the United States. The General Education Board also has rendered a real service in the series of yearly conferences running for a period of several weeks during the summer, which conferences have been attended by business officers of institutions located in different sections of the country.

Other agencies which have contributed greatly to the progress made, especially since the war, in the improvement of the business administration of our institutions of higher learning, are the Associations of University and College Business Officers. The Eastern Association now has a membership of over one hundred and the Mid-Western Association a membership of approximately fifty-five. Yearly meetings of these bodies are held and standing committees function throughout the year dealing with many perplexing problems common to all member institutions.

This work, however, is only the beginning; for although much has been done in the field of the budget, and accounting and general administration, very little has been done, except on the part of the institutions individually, in the field of the handling of permanent funds and their investment and care.

Your Commission, among other things, has considered the advisability of having prepared a handbook of information covering the general field of care and handling of

permanent funds, a book which might supplement and be a companion to the above-mentioned book. Also in connection with this general subject of assistance which your Commission might render to colleges in coping with the problems arising from the handling of endowment funds, two recommendations of service agencies are receiving consideration. The first we have called, for want of a better name, "The Educational Institutions' Advisory Investment Bureau." This bureau would be of service to underwriting member institutions in rendering capable advice and counsel to the officers of the institutions and the finance committees upon the investment of funds, also in keeping all members conversant with the best methods used by the leading financial institutions in the handling of their investment problems. It would be operated by a director chosen by an advisory committee of nine members, which committee would be selected from the finance committees of member institutions. Such a bureau would not only serve as a clearing house for member institutions for all problems arising in connection with the handling of permanent funds but would also indicate to friends of the colleges associated in its support that these colleges were making every effort to protect the investment of permanent funds and also keep abreast of the times with reference to practices followed by leading financial institutions in the handling of permanent funds.

The second agency considered is the trust company. Dr. A. W. Anthony, a member of your Commission, has said with reference to the trust company's value to the institution of higher learning:

> Trust companies and banks have been created as agencies for technical and highly specialized services in the field of finance. Colleges and universities are organized and incorporated for educational purposes, equally technical and specialized in the field of education. These two fields of specialization are entirely different. Nevertheless, in each of them are men, as individuals, qualified, interested and active in the other. It has come to pass, therefore, that in the edu-

cational institutions of the country as trustees, members of finance committees and even as treasurers, are many bankers, officials of trust companies and expert financiers. In some instances colleges and universities have built up out of such highly specialized and well qualified board members and associates, finance departments nearly equivalent to a trust company or a specialized bank for the purposes of the institution itself. This situation has developed through the years in the case of the largest and best endowed colleges and universities of the country. Nine of the educational institutions of this country have endowments of more than ten millions of dollars apiece. About twenty of these educational institutions possess more than half of the permanent funds of all the colleges and universities of the country.

But the majority of educational institutions, particularly colleges, may beneficially use the services of experts in finance, as custodians, agents and trustees.

Dr. Anthony has also pointed out the specific services which trust companies may render, the mechanical handling of investment securities in behalf of colleges and universities, furnishing custodial care and acting as trustees for specific funds:

> Banks and trust companies are one of the great groups busied with guarding and administering funds, the benefits of which reach far into the future. As friends of colleges and universities they can be of very great helpfulness. They are trusted advisers of large numbers of depositors and clients. As trustees they have the elements of permanency, of detached impersonal discretion, of expertness in finance, of definite location, of ample financial responsibility.

The consideration given to the subjects discussed above can, we believe, be justified, for in the effort to secure additional funds all colleges must make sure, first, that their financial structure is as strong as it is possible to build it, that the prospective donor may need to give but little thought to the question, "If I give, will my funds be handled wisely?"

Now as to the second general question, namely, "How best can this Association, through its Commission on Perma-

permanent funds, a book which might supplement and be a companion to the above-mentioned book. Also in connection with this general subject of assistance which your Commission might render to colleges in coping with the problems arising from the handling of endowment funds, two recommendations of service agencies are receiving consideration. The first we have called, for want of a better name, "The Educational Institutions' Advisory Investment Bureau." This bureau would be of service to underwriting member institutions in rendering capable advice and counsel to the officers of the institutions and the finance committees upon the investment of funds, also in keeping all members conversant with the best methods used by the leading financial institutions in the handling of their investment problems. It would be operated by a director chosen by an advisory committee of nine members, which committee would be selected from the finance committees of member institutions. Such a bureau would not only serve as a clearing house for member institutions for all problems arising in connection with the handling of permanent funds but would also indicate to friends of the colleges associated in its support that these colleges were making every effort to protect the investment of permanent funds and also keep abreast of the times with reference to practices followed by leading financial institutions in the handling of permanent funds.

The second agency considered is the trust company. Dr. A. W. Anthony, a member of your Commission, has said with reference to the trust company's value to the institution of higher learning:

> Trust companies and banks have been created as agencies for technical and highly specialized services in the field of finance. Colleges and universities are organized and incorporated for educational purposes, equally technical and specialized in the field of education. These two fields of specialization are entirely different. Nevertheless, in each of them are men, as individuals, qualified, interested and active in the other. It has come to pass, therefore, that in the edu-

cational institutions of the country as trustees, members of finance committees and even as treasurers, are many bankers, officials of trust companies and expert financiers. In some instances colleges and universities have built up out of such highly specialized and well qualified board members and associates, finance departments nearly equivalent to a trust company or a specialized bank for the purposes of the institution itself. This situation has developed through the years in the case of the largest and best endowed colleges and universities of the country. Nine of the educational institutions of this country have endowments of more than ten millions of dollars apiece. About twenty of these educational institutions possess more than half of the permanent funds of all the colleges and universities of the country.

But the majority of educational institutions, particularly colleges, may beneficially use the services of experts in finance, as custodians, agents and trustees.

Dr. Anthony has also pointed out the specific services which trust companies may render, the mechanical handling of investment securities in behalf of colleges and universities, furnishing custodial care and acting as trustees for specific funds:

> Banks and trust companies are one of the great groups busied with guarding and administering funds, the benefits of which reach far into the future. As friends of colleges and universities they can be of very great helpfulness. They are trusted advisers of large numbers of depositors and clients. As trustees they have the elements of permanency, of detached impersonal discretion, of expertness in finance, of definite location, of ample financial responsibility.

The consideration given to the subjects discussed above can, we believe, be justified, for in the effort to secure additional funds all colleges must make sure, first, that their financial structure is as strong as it is possible to build it, that the prospective donor may need to give but little thought to the question, "If I give, will my funds be handled wisely?"

Now as to the second general question, namely, "How best can this Association, through its Commission on Perma-

nent and Trust Funds, enlist the cooperation of helpful agencies?"

Your Commission has determined that trust companies and insurance companies will cooperate; in fact, in individual cases they are now cooperating. It is now considering the more specific question, however, as to how best it may enlist their cooperation, or, in the words of Mr. Arnett, "in what way the resources of these organizations and professions can be mobilized for the purpose." The Commission has concluded that the first step in this process is to acquaint these institutions with the financial conditions of institutions of higher learning, particularly with the needs for future funds. A means of doing this may be the preparation of a pamphlet or pamphlets for wide distribution. Preliminary information has already been secured by Dr. Kelly's office from a number of institutions which will be helpful in the preparation of such material. Through Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony, Chairman of the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, your Commission is having the opportunity to study the methods used by many of the large national organizations in the field of religion and education and particularly the plan adopted by several of these organizations which use "The Uniform Trust for Public Uses," as drawn up by Mr. Daniel S. Remsen, a member of the New York Bar and a recognized authority on the law of wills and living trusts. The methods used by these organizations and others in enlisting the cooperation of trust companies and insurance companies are also being studied.

Your Commission does not have power in itself to carry out any definite plans in behalf of the Association. It is advisory in character, an investigating body reporting its findings to your Executive Committee and through it to the Association. It is functioning and giving serious consideration to these very important problems. It is not ready as yet to render any full and comprehensive report, therefore at this time can report only progress.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES FOR 1928–1929

ROBERT L. KELLY

To the Members of the Association:

I have the honor to present the report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges for the year 1928–29.

The Executive Committee has held four meetings during the year, the first on February 4, consuming an entire day, and subsequent meetings for a half-day on March 22 and December 6, with a final brief session this morning, January 11. At these meetings the work of the Association office has been planned and reviewed, a working budget for the year 1928 has been adopted and revised, the budget for 1929 has been considered, vacancies on permanent commissions have been filled; official appointments made as required, including the appointment of the Executive Secretary as a member of the Joint Committee on Research in Colleges, of Dean Hawkes and the Secretary as members of the Carnegie Corporation Library Committee, and a Special Committee on a Study of Graduate Schools—President Hughes of Iowa State College, Dr. Robertson of the American Council on Education, and our President, Mr. Arnett; the program for detail handling of THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE business was approved, price and discounts authorized; publication of studies in the BULLETIN approved; time, place and program of the annual meeting determined; publicity and reporting provided for. The appointments on the Nominating Committee have been confirmed.

The office has been concerned during the year, directly and indirectly, with a number of significant publications.

Extensive distribution has been given to *The Effective College,* for which there continues to be a steady demand both in this country and abroad. It is used as a major reference book by departments in College Education in the Graduate Schools promoting education on the college level. This book was used last summer as a text-book for the National Conference of Chinese Colleges at Shanghai. The Treasurer's report shows a profit to the Association of $767.63 received last year, which will be increased still further from the sale of the stock on hand.

The Council of Church Boards of Education issued the *Handbook of Christian Education for 1928,* one copy of which as the May issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION was sent to each college holding membership in the Association. The *Handbook* has also had an extensive distribution as a valuable book of reference.

The entire manuscript of the book, *College Architecture in America—And Its Part in the Development of the Campus,* has passed through the office and has been read and criticized by the Executive Secretary and by Dr. Frederick P. Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation, who constitute a subcommittee of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in the Fine Arts with editorial functions. The publishers are Charles Scribner's Sons. The appearance of the book has been delayed owing to the acceptance of plans for extensive illustration, for which the Carnegie Corporation has made an additional appropriation. Meantime, there has been continuous demand from member colleges for suggestions on many types of college buildings and on campus development, which has been partially met by various chapter proofs and preprints. The members of the Association will be notified when the book is ready for delivery. The price has been fixed at the nominal sum of $5.00 per copy. The Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in the Fine Arts will make some recommendation to the Association for the further development of its work.

There has been issued during the past year by the Institute of Social and Religious Research a book entitled *Undergraduates,* dealing with moral and religious conditions in American colleges, for the contents and make-up of which this office is in no sense responsible, but which grew out of a suggestion made six years ago by the Council of Church Boards of Education. The study which led to the publication of the book was endorsed by the Association of American Colleges at the annual meeting in Chicago, January, 1923.

The demand for the BULLETIN of the Association continues to increase not only among the member colleges but among other agencies and individuals. Several member colleges have taken regularly sixty subscriptions to the BULLETIN at the special reduced rate of fifty cents for each annual subscription, and forty-two colleges take an average of twenty copies each, with a minimum of ten subscriptions. The number of orders from non-members at the $3.00 rate continues to grow, although no campaign has been recently inaugurated. The BULLETIN goes to institutions in the following foreign countries: Canada, China, England, France, Germany, India, New Zealand; as well as to Hawaii, Porto Rico and the Philippines. The 1928 issues have contained the addresses and proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting held at Atlantic City the second week of January, studies of the Occidental Colleges and the colleges of Minnesota by the Executive Secretary, and preliminary data for this meeting in the form of improved methods of college teaching. There has been a greatly increased demand for offprints.

More than half of the members of the Association have called upon the office during the year for back copies of the BULLETIN to complete their files, and scores of letters and packages have been exchanged in the effort to render this service to the colleges.

Studies have been completed during the year of the organization and operation of Marietta College and of the

group of five Episcopal Colleges—Hobart, Kenyon, St. Stephen's, The University of the South, and Trinity (Conn.), and a study is now in process of Denison University. The Executive Secretary has continued his official connection as a Lecturer to graduate students at Teachers College, Columbia, and the School of Education, New York University. He lectured during the summer term at the University of Minnesota on College Administration, and during the year on a variety of themes at numerous undergraduate colleges and educational associations.

Two very elaborate studies have been completed by the Council since we last met in annual session bearing on the make-up of the denominational college faculty. In these studies we had the cooperation of about 200 colleges related to our Boards of Education. One is an inquiry as to the methods by which the denominational colleges construct their faculties, and the other deals with what constitutes a "great teacher." It is hoped that they will contribute something to our general theme, "The College Teacher."*

Distinct progress has been made during the year in the field of financial and fiduciary matters, or in what we have called the "Campaign of Perseverance." Numerous colleges have taken a lively interest in these developments. They are issuing appealing literature furnished by this office or agencies with which this office is in affiliation. There was a well attended college sectional meeting in connection with the recent conference on annuities held in New York, in which the participants exchanged information and experience in this field. Some of the colleges have submitted to our office special plans for increasing capital funds, jointly devised by themselves and certain insurance companies. Others report the cordial interest and cooperation of trust companies and attorneys. The Uniform Trust for Public Uses has now been adopted by banks and trust companies in nine different states which are settling estates and organizing trusts in terms of this remarkable document. It has been endorsed as well by many national agencies.

* For findings of these studies see pp. 49–67.

It is suggested that it should be approved officially by the Association of American Colleges at this meeting.

Mr. D. S. Remsen, of the New York Bar, has announced a forthcoming new edition of his book on *The Preparation and Contest of Wills,* in which he will give full and sympathetic treatment to the post-war tax laws, and the recent development of living and life insurance trusts. The new edition is being prepared to meet the demands of lawyers for authoritative advice in the preparation of new testamentary provisions and forms of trust of a more or less unusual character. The first book is the standard work on the subject and is found in ten thousand law offices and law libraries. The new book will doubtless have as wide a distribution as its predecessor. The Association's Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, under the chairmanship of Mr. Trevor Arnett, has been making an investigation into the best types of gifts for colleges and the best statements of charitable purpose to be effected by the gifts. These are typical ways in which the foundations are being laid for the normal increase of the capital funds of our colleges, as attorneys, trust companies and insurance companies develop their regular business.

The Carnegie Corporation has extended an invitation to the Executive Secretary and Dean Hawkes, of Columbia University, to represent the Association in a small committee whose function it is to study methods of improving college libraries. All the other members of this committee with the exception of the Executive Secretary of the American Library Association are officers of colleges which hold membership in the Association of American Colleges. A preliminary *modus operandi* is now being set up under the chairmanship of William W. Bishop, Librarian of the University of Michigan.

The Joint Commission on Research in Colleges, consisting of representatives of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council,

the American Council on Education, the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, in a recent meeting at Washington passed the following resolutions:

> That this Committee suggest and recommend to the Association of American Colleges that the Association provide for a cooperative study of the intellectual life of American colleges.
>
> That this Committee continue in existence and actively support the Association of American Colleges in this undertaking.
>
> That Doctor Mann be authorized to represent this Committee at the Chattanooga meeting of the Association of American Colleges, January 10–12, 1929.

The Executive Committee of our Association has taken the following action:

> VOTED: That the Executive Committee approve the action of the Joint Committee on Research in Colleges and recommend favorable consideration of its recommendation to the Association in January.

For several years reference has been made in these annual reports to the increasing demands upon the office for authoritative information concerning about every conceivable phase of college administration and teaching. The demands upon the office this year have exceeded those of any previous year if not of all previous years. Concurrently with the development of this function of the joint office, the appeal to the colleges for data, usually through the means of more or less well disguised questionnaires, has become an acute if not irritating academic dilemma. It is becoming more and more clear that the joint office should assume larger responsibilities in this field and thereby render the double service of offering fuller and more thorough answers to the questions of our members, and of relieving the colleges themselves from part at least of the onerous duties now demanded of them by insistent students of American higher education. Since each college cannot

establish a fully manned information bureau of its own, all the colleges together might establish here a more thoroughgoing arrangement with free service to all members. It is scarcely likely that the dream of one of our most distinguished college presidents will come true:

> I feel very strongly that there should somewhere, and presumably in your office, be organized a service which would enable us to refer all such matters to a central office rather than being under the necessity of sending questionnaires or private inquiries to many institutions. Perhaps the happy day will come when, such an office being established, we may in turn receive questionnaires from that office only.

But we might approximate at least to the accomplishment of the American Library Association in this field, a leading officer of which recently wrote:

> I am beginning to believe that there ought to be, somewhere in our educational system, definite provision for instruction in formulating questionnaires, and possibly a general agreement as to definitions of terms employed. We are trying to get that among librarians, and I think this effort is probably one of the very best results of the survey which I suggested almost ten years ago, and which has been carried out by the American Library Association. Even though the definitions are somewhat faulty they are far better than no definitions.

The Executive Committee of the Association has approved the suggestion, therefore, that the membership fee of the Association be increased from $25.00 to $50.00, and that provision be made for extending the work of the joint office by the appointment of an educational specialist definitely assigned to the task of research and counsel in the college field. No small part of the work of this department of the office would be in partially arresting the present irresistible flow of questionnaires, or schedules as they are more politely called, and in helping to frame approved schedules in such form as to be somewhat definite and intelligible. In view of the possible acceptance of this sug-

gestion by the Association, the Executive Committee recommends that the matter of the adoption of a budget for the year 1929 be left with power to the incoming Committee.

The Executive Committee nominates the following colleges for membership in the Association:

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
The College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee.
University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Mercer University, Macon, Ga.
Milligan College, Milligan, Tennessee.
Nazareth College, Louisville, Kentucky.
New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, N. J.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Salem College, Salem College, West Virginia.
Wagner Memorial Lutheran College, Staten Island, N. Y.
West Virginia Collegiate Institute, Institute, W. Va.

A word of appreciation may be expressed for the cordial way in which the member colleges have cooperated this year with the officers and commissions in the conduct of the year's work which finds its consummation in this fifteenth annual meeting. The Executive Secretary wishes to bear testimony also to the devotion to their work in season and out of season, of the members of the office staff. They work long hours and under high pressure that the interests of the colleges may be served.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES FOR THE YEAR 1928

January 1, 1929.

To the Association of American Colleges:

Your Treasurer reports, first, the following receipts and disbursements from January 1, 1928, to December 31, 1928:

Receipts:			
Balance on hand Jan. 1, 1928		$5,846.94	
Dues from member colleges:			
1926— 1 at $25.00	$ 25.00		
1927— 7 at 25.00	175.00		
1928—387 at 25.00	9,675.00		
1929— 3 at 25.00	75.00	9,950.00	
Bulletin Sales		2,527.69	
Annual Meeting, refund on 1928 meeting		31.14	
"The Effective College" Sales		3,789.04	
Interest on Deposits		373.42	
			$22,518.23
Disbursements:			
Annual Meeting		$ 545.20	
Dues, American Council on Education		100.00	
Expenses Executive Committee		159.63	
Bulletin Publication Expenses		3,574.51	
Subscriptions to *Christian Education*		299.25	
Expenses of Executive Secretary's Office		5,850.00	
Expenses of Commissions		713.95	
Expenses of Treasurer's Office		146.58	
Dr. Kelly's Insurance Premium		480.00	
Publication Expenses of "The Effective College"		3,021.41	
Emergency		100.15	
Fine Arts Project (Book)		1,000.00	
			$15,990.68
Balance on hand December 31, 1928			$ 6,527.55

Of this amount $3,527.55 was on deposit, December 31, 1928, in the First National Bank of Red Hook, New York, and $3,000 was in that bank on Certificate of Deposit bearing interest at 4½ per cent. Of the balance on hand, $1,000 is held in trust for use of the Fine Arts Commission, to complete the publication of a book which they have had in preparation for over two years, and which is being financed through a gift from the Carnegie Corporation made two years ago. (The gift was originally $5,000, of which $4,000 has been spent.) The remaining balance in our hands, *$5,527.55, represents the actual funds of the Association.*

The balance on hand of our own funds, exclusive of the aforementioned amount held in trust, on December 31, 1927, was $3,846.94. The balance on hand today is $5,527.55, which means that *the assets of the Association have increased during the present calendar year by $1,680.61,* and this despite the fact that the business of the Association, and the services which it has rendered to its membership, have been much larger and more expensive than ever before in our history. The increase in balance is partly due to the publication of the book known as *The Effective College.* The total receipts during the year for this book were $3,789.04 and the total expenses of publication and distribution were $3,021.41. The Association has made a net profit on this publication of $767.63. The rest of the increase is due to our having had a larger number of dues-paying members.

Your Treasurer also submits a schedule showing to what extent the receipts and disbursements correspond with the authorizations of the budget, first in its original form and second as amended by the Executive Committee, as follows:

BUDGET ANALYSIS

	Original budget	*Amended budget*	*Received*
Receipts:			
Balance Jan. 1, 1928	$5,846.94	$5,846.94	$5,846.94
Dues Member Colleges	9,750.00	10,000.00	9,950.00
Bulletin Sales	1,750.00	2,400.00	2,527.69
"Effective College" Sales		3,700.00	3,789.04
Interest			373.42
Refund on Annual Meeting			31.14
Disbursements:			
Annual Meeting	500.00	500.00	545.20
Dues American Council	100.00	100.00	100.00
Expenses Executive Committee	300.00	300.00	159.63
Bulletin Publication Expenses	2,700.00	3,700.00	3,574.51
Subscriptions to *Christian Education*	310.00	310.00	299.25
Executive Secretary's Office	5,850.00	5,850.00	5,850.00
Expenses of Commissions	2,500.00	1,000.00	713.95
Expenses of Treasurer's Office	150.00	150.00	146.58
Dr. Kelly's Insurance Premium	480.00	480.00	480.00
Publication Expenses "The Effective College"		2,750.00	3,021.41
Emergency	150.00	150.00	100.15
Fine Arts Project (Book)	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00

Your Treasurer has been asked by the Executive Committee to include in his report a fair statement of the assets of the Association over and above cash in hand. Your Treasurer is not responsible for these assets and therefore transmits, for information only, a summary of data furnished by the Executive Secretary, which shows that the Association is in possession of the following:

Miscellaneous Office Supplies	$ 248.00	
689 copies "The Effective College" at $1.60 per copy	1,102.40	
Outstanding Accounts "The Effective College"	134.40	
998 copies Back Issues of the *Bulletin* at 25c each	249.50	
Bound volumes of *Bulletin* at $3.00	45.00	
Total		$1,779.30

In the judgment of your Treasurer, it is not wise to value unsold books or unsold bulletins at more than fifty per cent of their list value. This would reduce this amount of non-cash assets by $698.45, to $1,080.85. Adding this amount, $1,080.85, to the cash assets on hand, $6,527.55, it would appear that *the total assets of the Association are $7,608.40.*

The Executive Committee has asked your Treasurer to present to you a budget for 1929 which contemplates the carrying on of approximately the same sort and amount of work during the coming year as in the year 1928. Such a program can be paid for with the present assets and with the receipts normally to be expected within the year.

SUGGESTED MINIMUM BUDGET FOR 1929

	Suggested budget, 1929	*Actual business 1928*
RECEIPTS		
Balance on hand January 1	$ 6,527.55	$5,846.94
Dues from Member Colleges	10,000.00	9,950.00
Bulletin Sales	2,500.00	2,527.69
"Effective College" Sales	500.00	3,789.04
	$19,527.55	
DISBURSEMENTS		
Fine Arts Commission (Book)	1,000.00	1,000.00
Annual Meeting	700.00	545.20
Dues American Council on Education	100.00	100.00
Expenses Executive Committee	300.00	159.63
Bulletin Publication	3,700.00	3,574.51
Subscriptions to *Christian Education*	410.00	299.25
Expenses Executive Secretary's Office	6,000.00	5,850.00
Expenses of Commissions	1,000.00	713.95
Expenses Treasurer's Office	200.00	146.58
Dr. Kelly's Insurance Premium	480.00	480.00
Distribution Expenses "The Effective College"	150.00	3,021.41
Emergency	150.00	100.15
	$14,190.00	
Anticipated Balance, Jan. 1, 1930	$ 5,337.00	

The Executive Secretary is prepared to advocate, before the Annual Meeting, the employment of a research assistant, at a salary of $5,000 a year. As an alternative to this, the Executive Committee has suggested that we pay a portion of Dr. Kelly's salary as Executive Secretary, to the extent of $3,000, and then appropriate $2,000 for a research assistant. Up to the present time Dr. Kelly has served this Association without any pay, and he is perfectly willing to continue so to do. The Executive Committee does not believe that it is wise to permit him to do this, but does believe that the Association should take over at least $3,000 worth of his salary as its responsibility. By either alternative the expenses of the Association will be increased by $5,000. It is not the function of your Treasurer to deal with the advisability of these proposals or with the advisability of any other additional projects which the Association at its annual meeting may see fit to authorize. It is his duty to inform the Association that *no such projects can be safely undertaken unless additional sources of income are discovered.* If the membership dues are raised from $25.00 to $40.00, as has been suggested by some of the members, there would be an increased income of $6,000.00 a year.

The following institutions, which have not paid their dues for two successive years, have ceased to be members of the Association: St. Joseph's College of Maine and Central Wesleyan College of Missouri. Your Treasurer has discovered that the Women's College of Delaware, listed as a member, has ceased to exist as an independent college, and has dropped it from the list of members.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) BERNARD I. BELL,
Treasurer.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

To the Members of the Association:

The Auditing Committee has examined the books of the Treasurer and finds that all disbursements have been made by check and are accompanied by proper vouchers. It further finds that the reported balance on hand of $6,527.55 is evidenced by a certificate of deposit of the First National Bank of Red Hook, New York, of $3,000, and a bank balance on a checking account as of January 2, 1929, of $3,527.55.

Respectfully submitted,

CLIFTON D. GRAY,

CHARLES H. RAMMELKAMP, Chairman

Chattanooga, Tenn.

January 11, 1929.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE, JANUARY 10–12, 1929

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10

First Session

The fifteenth annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges held at the Read House, Chattanooga, Tenn., January 10–12, 1929, opened with the annual dinner Thursday evening at 7:00 o'clock, Mr. Trevor Arnett, President of the Association, presiding.

After dinner there were speeches interspersed with vocal selections by a double quartet from the University of Chattanooga. President Arnett, President-Emeritus William L. Poteat, of Wake Forest College, and the Hon. Vincent Massey, P. C., Minister Plenipotentiary from the Canadian Government at Washington, spoke. Their addresses are found in this BULLETIN.

At the conclusion of the program, appointment of the following committees was announced by the President: *Committee on Resolutions,* President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, Chairman, Presidents W. J. Martin, Davidson College, and A. A. Brown, University of Chattanooga; *Committee on Audit of the Treasurer's Books,* President C. H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College, Chairman, and President C. D. Gray, Bates College.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 P. M.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 11

Second Session

The meeting convened at 9:35 Friday morning, President Arnett in the chair. The entire program for the morning

was in the hands of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, which gave special attention to the second phase of its responsibility. The Chairman, President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College, presented the report of the Commission in two parts. Part I—dealing with the training of graduate students for college teaching—was read, accompanied by a full statement of the reasons underlying the recommendations of the Commission. President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University, and Dean Marshall S. Brown, New York University, members of the Commission, made supplementary statements. Dean M. E. Haggerty, of the University of Minnesota, spoke by invitation of the Chairman. Dr. Robert L. Kelly closed the discussion and read a paper on "The Graduate School of Duke University," prepared by President W. P. Few, who had been unexpectedly called home.

At tbis point President Arnett introduced the following fraternal delegates: from the American Association of University Professors, Professors David W. Cornelius, University of Chattanooga, and L. R. Hesler, University of Tennessee; from the American Association of Junior Colleges, President J. L. Robb, Tennessee Wesleyan College.

President Wilkins continued presentation of the report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers. He read Part II—dealing with the training of young college instructors—with explanatory comment. Dean Otis E. Randall, Brown University, and President J. L. McConaughy in behalf of Dean Raper, Syracuse University, unable to be present, members of the Commission, followed with supplementary statements. Dean R. A. Kent, Northwestern University, Presidents D. L. Marsh, Boston University, C. H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College, J. H. Apple, Hood College, H. P. Rainey, Franklin College, E. M. Antrim, Oklahoma City University, W. J. Davidson, Illinois Wesleyan University, R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College, H. L. McCracken, Penn College and A. B. Storms, Baldwin-Wallace College, participated in the discussion of the report.

On motion of President Wilkins, it was

VOTED: That the report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers be referred with favorable recommendation to the Committee on Resolutions, with the understanding that it re-submit the report, with its own recommendation as to adoption, on Saturday morning, and that a motion regarding official transmission to the Association of American Universities, the regional associations and the American Association of University Professors will then be in order.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 P. M.

Third Session

President Arnett called the meeting to order at 2:15 P. M.

The report of the Treasurer was read by Warden Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College.

VOTED: That the Treasurer's report be received subject to approval of the Auditing Committee.

The report of the Auditing Committee was called for and President C. D. Gray, of Bates College, in the absence of Chairman Rammelkamp, presented the report.

VOTED: To approve the report of the Auditing Committee.

The report of the Executive Committee and Executive Secretary was read by Dr. Robert L. Kelly. It was

VOTED: That the report be accepted, and the colleges nominated for membership be admitted to the Association.

Upon motion of President F. M. Hunter, University of Denver, it was unanimously

VOTED: That the Association recommend to the Committee on Resolutions inclusion in its report of a resolution approving the suggestion of the Executive Committee that the annual dues of the Association be raised to $50.00 and that the Executive Secretary be authorized to establish a research department in his office.

The other items in this report were, by common consent, referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Dr. Charles R. Mann, Director of the American Council on Education, made a statement on behalf of the Joint Committee on Research in Colleges, earnestly advocating adoption of the recommendations for cooperation contained in the report presented by the Executive Secretary.

President E. E. Rall, North Central College, presented a college report blank tentatively approved by the Council of Church Boards of Education for adoption by authorized national educational agencies in securing statistical data. The suggestion was made that the blank might be further studied and improved by a joint committee representing both the Council and the Association. It was

VOTED: That the college report blank submitted by President Rall, together with his suggestion of its reference to a joint committee of the Council of Church Boards of Education and the Association of American Colleges for further study, be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Trevor Arnett, Chairman of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, read the statement prepared for the Commission by Mr. Raymond N. Ball, University of Rochester, who was unable to be present, reported progress on behalf of that Commission and asked for extension of time to continue its work. It was

VOTED: That the report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds was received and placed on file.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 P. M. that members of the Association might visit the environs of Chattanooga as guests of the City Chamber of Commerce.

Fourth Session

The Association convened at 7:30 Friday evening, President Arnett presiding.

President W. W. Boyd, The Western College for Women, Chairman of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, presented its report. President R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College, a member of the Commission, made a supplementary statement. President

Boyd then moved that its recommendations be adopted, the Commission be discharged, and a copy of the report sent to the American Association of University Professors. After discussion it was

VOTED: That the report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure be accepted and referred to the Committee on Resolutions, for appropriate recommendation.

President Boyd made a brief report of the meeting of the American Association of University Professors, to which he, President Lewis, of Lafayette College, and Dr. Furst, of the Carnegie Foundation, were fraternal delegates from the Association of American Colleges.

Professor David W. Cornelius and Professor L. R. Hesler were invited to address the Association. They extended fraternal greetings from the American Association of University Professors and expressed cordial appreciation of the Association's treatment of the theme of the meeting—"The College Teacher."

Professor Bert E. Young, Indiana University, Chairman, presented the report of the Commission on College Athletics. There followed a lively discussion of the recommendations of the Commission in which the following participated: Dr. Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College, Presidents Raymond Binford, Guilford College, H. J. Burgstahler, Cornell College, W. J. Martin, Davidson College, H. M. Gage, Coe College, D. L. Marsh, Boston University, J. W. Provine, Mississippi College, A. B. Storms, Baldwin-Wallace College, Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College, E. E. Rall, North Central College, and R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College. It was

VOTED: That the Association of American Colleges gives hearty approval to the ideals expressed in the report of the Commission on Athletics.

Dr. Charles R. Mann, Chairman of the Commission on Educational Surveys, presented the report of that Commission.

After reading the prepared report, Dr. Mann asked the privilege of making certain observations regarding the program of the annual meeting and suggested certain norms for measurement and improvement of successful teacher training in colleges and universities, with a view to making further studies in this field in the coming year.

The report of the Commission on Educational Surveys was received and placed on file.

In the absence of the Chairman, President L. B. Hopkins, Wabash College, Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University, presented the findings of the Commission on Personnel Technique, as reported in schedules recently submitted to members of the Association on types of personnel work and their practical application in college administration.

The report for the Commission on Personnel Technique was received and placed on file.

Dean Melvin E. Haggerty, University of Minnesota, addressed the Association on "Experimentation with the College Teacher's Problems."

The Association adjourned at 10:00 P. M.

Fifth Session

President Arnett called the meeting to order at 8:45 Saturday morning.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions was called for.

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, presented the following report, each item of which was unanimously adopted:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

The Committee on Resolutions moved adoption of the following:

I

The recommendations of the Special Committee on Fraudulent Institutions, President Frederick P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation, Chairman, as submitted below:

The fraudulent college is a source of real danger to the cause of sound academic standards, and the Association of American Colleges which stands committed to their maintenance, will do everything in its power to defend those standards. Perhaps its greatest usefulness would appear to be in providing an impartial tribunal to decide whether any college under suspicion or under charges is in fact a fraudulent institution.

It is recommended that the Association authorize its President upon receipt of a request from any responsible sources either (a) to bring the case to the attention of the appropriate regional educational organization (as, for example, the North Central Association) for suitable action, or, in his discretion, (b) to appoint a committee of three from among its own membership to ascertain whether any institution announcing that it provides liberal training on the college level is capable of providing such training and is in fact doing so.

II

That the Report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, presented January 11, 1929, be approved and the officers authorized to carry out its recommendations.

III

That the membership fee be increased from $25.00 to $50.00 per year.

IV

That the action of the Executive Committee in accepting the invitation of the Carnegie Corporation to become the agency under its auspices in promoting plans for the improvement of college libraries be approved.

V

That we approve the recommendation of the Executive Committee that a Department of Educational Research be added to the organization of the Association.

VI

That the Association approve and recommend to its constituent members the use of "The Uniform Trust for Public Uses."

VII

That the whole report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure be referred with power to the Executive Committee.

VIII

That the following resolution submitted by President Storms, of Baldwin-Wallace College, be referred with power to the Executive Committee, so that it can be considered carefully in connection with the work of President Wilkins' Committee:

> *Resolved,* That the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers be authorized to undertake a survey of the important graduate schools of the country with respect to their faculty personnel, scope of work offered, equipment and evidence of distinctive success in the training of college teachers as well as in preparing students for research in various fields.

IX

That the following recommendation submitted by Professor Mitchell, of Leland Stanford Junior University, be adopted:

> It has been brought to the attention of this Association that during the last four years a plan has been developed, in the colleges and universities of Southern California, for the organization of what is described as "an educational movement to forward a better understanding between nations." It has recently been amalgamated with the National Student Federation of America, and has become one of its activities, being known as the International Education Division. The plan calls for the organization on each campus of a committee to correlate, stimulate and secure cooperation between the various international activities.
>
> It is therefore recommended that the members of this Association be asked to give such assistance to this effort to stimulate interest in international relations as may in their judgment be wise and expedient.

X

That the suggestions submitted by President Rall with respect to an information blank for college statistics, prepared by the Council of Church Boards of Education, be referred with power to the Executive Committee.

XI

That other items referred to in the report of the Executive Committee and Executive Secretary be referred with power to the incoming Executive Committee.

XII

That the Association extends to the officials of the Read House its appreciation of the unfailing courtesy with which

they have met the needs of the Association during this meeting and their care for the comfort of its members.

XIII

That the Association express to President Brown and his colleagues in the University of Chattanooga, and to all the citizens of Chattanooga who have so generously assisted in entertaining the Association, its grateful appreciation for all the courtesies extended, and especially for the excellent music furnished during the annual banquet and for the delightful drive about the interesting environs of Chattanooga.

XIV

That the appreciation of the Association be also extended to the newspapers of Chattanooga, *The Times* and *The News*, and to the Associated Press, the International News Service and the United Press, for their satisfactory service in reporting the sessions of the Association.

(Signed) DONALD J. COWLING, *Chairman.*

The question was raised whether the Association ought not to take action respecting legislation limiting the teaching of science, and on motion of President W. J. Davidson, Illinois Wesleyan University, it was

VOTED: To refer the matter of a pronouncement on anti-evolution legislation to the Resolutions Committee for some suggestion.

On motion of President C. H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College, it was

VOTED: That the Secretary of the Association be instructed to forward the report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers to the secretaries of the various regional associations, the Association of American Universities and the American Association of University Professors, with the suggestion that they refer the report to their appropriate committees.

On motion of President G. E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College, it was

VOTED: That the Association refer the suggestion that a telegram of endorsement of the Kellogg Peace Pact be sent to the United States Senate to the Committee on Resolutions.

On motion of President A. N. Ward, Western Maryland College, by rising vote it was unanimously

VOTED: That an appropriation of $500.00 be made from the funds of the Association and Dr. Kelly be requested at such time as may be convenient to him to take a month or two off for a complete rest.

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, presented the report of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts, of which he is Chairman. It was

VOTED: To accept and file the report of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts.

Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College, Chairman of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship, presented the report of this Commission, entitled "Cooperation between Secondary Schools and Colleges in Raising Intellectual Standards." It was

VOTED: To accept the report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship and place it on file.

The Commission on the Organization of the College Curriculum failed to bring in the anticipated report as announced on the program, owing to the unavoidable absence of the Chairman, and all members of the Commission.

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, Chairman, reported further for the Committee on Resolutions:

Your Committee recommends that the following action be taken by the Association:

> The Association of American Colleges in its entire history has never adopted a resolution not relating to matters directly within its own field. However, because of the overwhelming conviction of its members, the Association feels justified in making an exception to its established policy in the case of the Kellogg Peace Pact, now before the Senate of the United States. Therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the Association of American Colleges in annual meeting assembled and representing in its membership more than 400 colleges and universities in every section of the United States, urgently recommends the ratification of the Kellogg Pact, without reservations, and authorizes the President and Secretary of

the Association to take such steps as may be necessary to bring this resolution to the attention of the members of the Senate.

VOTED: To adopt the above resolution and authorize the President and Secretary of the Association of American Colleges to transmit it to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

President Cowling reported, finally, for the Committee on Resolutions that its members felt it would be a mistake for the Association to go on record, either for or against, the matter of legislation with reference to evolution. No action was taken.

President A. N. Ward, Western Maryland College, inquired whether the proceedings of the annual meeting could be published in one volume, instead of distributed in several issues of the BULLETIN. On suggestion of the Secretary, the question was put to the members present, and it was

VOTED: To print the proceedings in the first issue of the BULLETIN for 1929 (Vol. XV).

Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, presented its report as follows:

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Association of American Colleges desires to make the following nominations for officers of the Association for the year 1929–30:

PRESIDENT: President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College.

VICE-PRESIDENT: President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City.

TREASURER: Warden Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College, Columbia University.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

President Ada L. Comstock, Radcliffe College.
Mr. Trevor Arnett, New York City.

REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo (to succeed himself, and to serve for three years).

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL: Professor Arthur H. Compton, The University of Chicago.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS:

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman.*
President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation.
President J. H. T. Main, Grinnell College.
President W. P. Few, Duke University.
Mr. J. Frederick Larson, Dartmouth College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ATHLETICS:

Professor Bert E. Young, Indiana University, *Chairman.*
Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
Dean Joseph Reiner, Loyola University, Chicago.
President J. W. Provine, Mississippi College.
President H. M. Gage, Coe College.

COMMISSION ON THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION:

Controller G. C. Wintringer, Princeton University, *Chairman.*
Auditor N. C. Plimpton, The University of Chicago.
Controller Robert B. Stewart, Purdue University.
Professor Floyd W. Reeves, University of Kentucky.
President Walter F. Dexter, Whittier College.

COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS:

President Frank L. McVey, University of Kentucky, *Chairman.*
Dr. Charles R. Mann, Director, American Council on Education.
Professor C. H. Judd, The University of Chicago.

COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS:

President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College, *Chairman.*
Dean Otis E. Randall, Brown University.
President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University.
President Albert Britt, Knox College.
Dean Marshall S. Brown, New York University.
Dean Charles L. Raper, Syracuse University.

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP:

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College, *Chairman.*
Dean C. S. Boucher, The University of Chicago.
Dean C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College.
Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo.
President C. D. Gray, Bates College.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM:

President C. C. Little, University of Michigan, *Chairman.*
President Arthur E. Morgan, Antioch College.

President N. F. Coleman, Reed College.
President Ada L. Comstock, Radcliffe College.
Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University.

COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS:

Mr. Trevor Arnett, New York City, *Chairman.*
Treasurer Raymond N. Ball, University of Rochester.
Vice-President Lloyd Steere, The University of Chicago.
Treasurer J. L. Jackson, Davidson College.
Dr. A. W. Anthony, Trustee, Bates College.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS:

The President, *ex officio.*
The Executive Secretary, *ex officio.*
The Treasurer, *ex officio.*

Regarding the COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM, the Committee presents no nominations pending the action of the Executive Committee upon the recommendation made by the Commission itself, and we would therefore recommend that appointments to the Commission, if the Commission be continued, be left to action by the Executive Committee.

On motion of Chairman Effinger, it was

VOTED: That the nominations as presented in the recommendations of the Nominating Committee, and the recommendation regarding the possible appointments for the Commission on Academic Freedom be approved.

President Arnett declared the nominees duly elected.

There being no further business, at 10:15 A. M. it was

VOTED: To adjourn.

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES*

The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

Name: The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges."

Membership: All colleges which conform to the definition of a minimum college given in the By-Laws may become members of this Association. The General Secretaries of Church Boards of Education and officials of Educational Foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

Representation: Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the Faculty or Board of Trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of Church Boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of Foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

Officers: The Association shall elect a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices. The Secretary shall be the permanent executive officer of the Association, and shall serve without term until his successor is elected. The other officers shall serve for one year, or until their successors are duly elected. The Association shall also elect two others who, with the four officers named above, shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association. The President of the Association shall be *ex-officio* chairman of the Executive Committee. The election of officers shall be by ballot.

Meetings: At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Committee, provided that four

* Adopted as revised January 15, 1926.

weeks' notice be given each institution connected with the Association. Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

By-Laws: The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

Vacancies: The Executive Commtitee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

Amendments: Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present.

By-Laws

1. In order to be eligible to membership in this Association institutions shall require fifteen units for admission to the freshman class and 120 semester hours, or an equivalent, for graduation.
2. Applications for membership shall be made to the Executive Committee, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.
3. The annual dues shall be fifty dollars per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.
4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Executive Committee.
5. All expenditure of the funds of the Association shall be authorized by the Association, or, subject to later approval by the Association, by the Executive Committee.
6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.
7. The Secretary is authorized to mail three copies of all official bulletins to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional subscriptions, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be made at a special rate.

Policy

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and interhelpfulness rather than of exclusiveness.*

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1929

The Association of American Colleges is not a standardizing agency. Election to membership does not involve any kind of academic status except that stipulated in the *By-Laws* of the Association.

INSTITUTION	EXECUTIVE OFFICER*
ALABAMA	
Alabama College, Montevallo	O. C. Carmichael
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham	Guy E. Snavely
Howard College, Birmingham	John C. Dawson
Judson College, Marion	E. V. Baldy
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill	Joseph M. Walsh
Woman's College of Alabama, Montgomery	W. D. Agnew
ARIZONA	
University of Arizona,* Tucson	F. C. Lockwood, *Dean*
ARKANSAS	
Arkansas College, Batesville	E. B. Tucker
Hendrix College, Conway	J. H. Reynolds
CALIFORNIA	
Dominican College, San Rafael	Sister H. Raymond, *Dean*
College of the Holy Names, Oakland	Sister Mary Austin
Mills College, Mills College	Aurelia H. Reinhardt
Occidental College, Los Angeles	Remsen duBois Bird
College of the Pacific, Stockton	Tully C. Knoles
Pomona College, Claremont	Charles K. Edmunds
University of Redlands, Redlands	V. Leroy Duke
St. Mary's College, Oakland	Brother Lewis
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	R. B. Von KleinSmid
Stanford University,* Stanford University	Ray Lyman Wilbur
Whittier College, Whittier	W. F. Dexter
COLORADO	
Colorado College, Colorado Springs	Charles C. Mierow
University of Denver, Denver	Fred M. Hunter
Loretto Heights College, Loretto	Mother M. Eustachia

* By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the University College of Liberal Arts. Usually, though not always, the name of the Dean is given.

CONNECTICUT

Trinity College, Hartford — Remsen B. Ogilby
Wesleyan University, Middletown — J. L. McConaughy
Yale University,* New Haven — James R. Angell

DELAWARE

University of Delaware,* Newark — Walter Hullihen

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The American University, Washington — George B. Woods, *Dean*
The Catholic University of America,* Washington — James H. Ryan
George Washington University,* Washington — Cloyd H. Marvin
Georgetown University, Washington — Coleman Nevils
Howard University, Washington — Mordecai W. Johnson
Trinity College, Washington — Sister Raphael

FLORIDA

Florida State College, Tallahassee — Edward Conradi
John B. Stetson University, Deland — Lincoln Hulley
Rollins College, Winter Park — Hamilton Holt
Southern College, Lakeland — Ludd M. Spivey

GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur — J. R. McCain
Emory University, Emory University — Harvey W. Cox
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville — J. L. Beeson
University of Georgia,* Athens — C. M. Snelling
Mercer University, Macon — Spright Dowell
Piedmont College, Demorest — F. E. Jenkins
Shorter College, Rome — W. D. Furry
Wesleyan College, Macon — Wm. F. Quillian

IDAHO

College of Idaho, Caldwell — W. J. Boone
Gooding College, Wesleyan — Charles W. Tenney

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island — Gustav A. Andreen
Aurora College, Aurora — O. R. Jenks
Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria — F. R. Hamilton
Carthage College, Carthage — N. J. Gould Wickey
University of Chicago,* Chicago — C. S. Boucher, *Dean*
DePaul University, Chicago — Thos. F. Levan
Eureka College, Eureka — Richard Dickinson, *Act. Pres.*
Greenville College, Greenville — Leslie R. Marston

Illinois College, Jacksonville ..... C. H. Rammelkamp
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington ..... Wm. J. Davidson
Illinois Woman's College, Jacksonville ..... Clarence P. McClelland
James Millikin University, Decatur ..... Mark E. Penney
Knox College, Galesburg ..... Albert Britt
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest ..... H. M. Moore
Lincoln College, Lincoln ..... A. E. Turner
Lombard College, Galesburg ..... Curtis W. Reese
Loyola University,* Chicago ..... Joseph Reiner, *Dean*
McKendree College, Lebanon ..... Cameron Harmon
Monmouth College, Monmouth ..... T. H. McMichael
Mt. Morris College, Mt. Morris ..... O. W. Neber, *Act. Pres.*
Northwestern University,* Evanston ..... Walter Dill Scott
North Central College, Naperville ..... E. E. Rall
Rockford College, Rockford ..... W. A. Maddox
Rosary College, River Forest ..... Sister Evelyn
St. Viator College, Bourbonnais ..... James V. Rheams
Shurtleff College, Alton ..... George M. Potter
St. Xavier Woman's College, Chicago ..... Mother Mary Cyril
Wheaton College, Wheaton ..... James O. Buswell
Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago ..... Edward C. Jenkins

INDIANA

Butler University, Indianapolis ..... Robert J. Aley
De Pauw University, Greencastle ..... Garfield B. Oxnam
Earlham College, Richmond ..... David M. Edwards
Evansville College, Evansville ..... Earl E. Harper
Franklin College, Franklin ..... Homer P. Rainey
Hanover College, Hanover ..... W. A. Millis
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis ..... I. J. Good
Indiana University,* Bloomington ..... Wm. L. Bryan
Manchester College, North Manchester ..... Otto Winger
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame ..... Chas. L. O'Donnell
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute
St. Mary's of Notre Dame, Notre Dame ..... Mother M. Pauline
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Mother Mary Raphael
Taylor University, Upland ..... John Paul
Wabash College, Crawfordsville ..... L. B. Hopkins

IOWA

Buena Vista College, Storm Lake ..... E. L. Jones
Central College, Pella ..... John Wesselink
Clarke College, Dubuque ..... Sister Mary Clara Russell
Coe College, Cedar Rapids ..... H. M. Gage
Columbia College, Dubuque ..... Thos. Conroy

Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.....Herbert J. Burgstahler
Des Moines University, Des Moines.....Arthur E. Bennett, *Dean*
Drake University, Des Moines.....Daniel W. Morehouse
University of Dubuque, Dubuque.....Paul H. Buckholz
Grinnell College, Grinnell.....J. H. T. Main
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant.....James E. Coons
Luther College, Decorah.....Oscar L. Olson
Morningside College, Sioux City.....Frank E. Mossman
Parsons College, Fairfield.....Clarence W. Greene
Penn College, Oskaloosa.....H. L. McCracken
Simpson College, Indianola.....John L. Hillman
Upper Iowa University, Fayette.....J. W. Dickman
Western Union College, Le Mars.....Charles A. Mock

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin City.....Wallace B. Fleming
Bethany College, Lindsborg.....Ernest F. Pihlblad
College of Emporia, Emporia.....D. C. Schaffner, *Act. Pres.*
Friends University, Wichita.....W. O. Mendenhall
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina.....L. B. Bowers
McPherson College, McPherson.....V. F. Schwalm
Ottawa University, Ottawa.....Erdmann Smith
St. Mary's College, St. Mary's.....B. J. Rodman
Southwestern College, Winfield.....E. T. Franklin
Sterling College, Sterling.....R. T. Campbell
Washburn College, Topeka.....P. P. Womer
University of Wichita, Wichita.....Harold W. Foght

KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore.....L. R. Akers
Berea College, Berea.....W. J. Hutchins
Centre College, Danville.....Chas. J. Turck
Georgetown College, Georgetown.....M. B. Adams
University of Kentucky,* Lexington.....P. P. Boyd, *Dean*
University of Louisville,* Louisville.....S. M. Whinery, *Dean*
Nazareth College, Louisville.....Sister Berenice, *Dean*
Transylvania College, Lexington.....

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport.....George S. Sexton
Louisiana College, Pineville.....C. Cottingham
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.....Geo. W. Bond, *Act. Pres.*
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette.....Edwin L. Stephens

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston.....Clifton D. Gray
Bowdoin College, Brunswick.....Kenneth C. M. Sills

Colby College, Waterville ..... Franklin W. Johnson
University of Maine,* Orono ..... Harold S. Boardman

MARYLAND

Goucher College, Baltimore ..... William W. Guth
Hood College, Frederick ..... Joseph H. Apple
University of Maryland,* College Park ..... Raymond A. Pearson
Morgan College, Baltimore ..... J. O. Spencer
College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore ..... Sister M. Philemon
St. John's College, Annapolis ..... Enoch B. Garey
Washington College, Chestertown ..... Paul E. Titsworth
Western Maryland College, Westminster ..... A. N. Ward

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst College, Amherst ..... Arthur S. Pease
Boston College, Boston ..... James H. Dolan
Boston University,* Boston ..... Daniel L. Marsh
Clark College, Worcester ..... Wallace W. Atwood
Harvard University,* Cambridge ..... A. Lawrence Lowell
Holy Cross College, Worcester ..... J. M. Fox
International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield ..... L. L. Doggett
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley ..... Mary Emma Woolley
Radcliffe College, Cambridge ..... Ada L. Comstock
Simmons College, Boston ..... Henry Lefavour
Smith College, Northampton ..... W. A. Neilson
Tufts College, Tufts College ..... John A. Cousens
Wellesley College, Wellesley ..... Ellen F. Pendleton
Wheaton College, Norton ..... J. Edgar Park
Williams College, Williamstown ..... Harry A. Garfield
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester ..... Ralph Earle

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian ..... Harlan L. Feeman
Albion College, Albion ..... John L. Seaton
Alma College, Alma ..... Harry Means Crooks
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale ..... Wm. Gear Spencer
Hope College, Holland ..... Edward D. Dimnent
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo ..... Allan Hoben
Marygrove College, Detroit ..... Geo. Hermann Derry
Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing ..... Robert S. Shaw
Olivet College, Olivet ..... A. E. Vestling
University of Michigan,* Ann Arbor ..... John R. Effinger, *Dean*

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis ..... George Sverdrup
Carleton College, Northfield ..... D. J. Cowling

Concordia College, Moorhead — J. N. Brown
Hamline University, St. Paul — Alfred F. Hughes
Macalester College, St. Paul — John C. Acheson
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul — Sister Antonia
St. Olaf College, Northfield — L. W. Boe
College of St. Teresa, Winona — Sister Mary A. Molloy, *Dean*
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul — Thomas E. Cullen

MISSISSIPPI

Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain — Lawrence T. Lowrey
Millsaps College, Jackson — D. M. Key
Mississippi College, Clinton — J. W. Provine
Mississippi College for Women, Hattiesburg — J. L. Johnson
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus — J. C. Fant
University of Mississippi,* University — Alfred W. Milden, *Dean*

MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette — W. M. McMurry
Culver-Stockton College, Canton — John Hepler Wood
Drury College, Springfield — T. W. Nadal
Lindenwood College, St. Charles — John L. Roemer
University of Missouri,* Columbia — F. M. Tisdel, *Dean*
Missouri Valley College, Marshall — Geo. H. Mack
Park College, Parkville — F. W. Hawley
St. Louis University,* St. Louis — Thos. M. Knapp
Tarkio College, Tarkio — J. A. Thompson
Washington University,* St. Louis — George R. Throop
Webster College, Webster Groves — M. Louise, *Dean*
Westminster College, Fulton — M. E. Melvin
William Jewell College, Liberty — John F. Herget

MONTANA

Intermountain Union College, Helena — E. J. Klemme

NEBRASKA

Cotner College, Bethany — James B. Welden
Creighton University, Omaha — Wm. H. Agnew
Doane College, Crete — E. B. Dean
Grand Island College, Grand Island — J. M. Wells
Hastings College, Hastings — Calvin H. French
Midland College, Fremont — H. F. Martin
Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., University Place — I. B. Schreckengast
York College, York

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover — Ernest M. Hopkins
University of New Hampshire,* Durham — E. M. Lewis

NEW JERSEY

Georgian Court College, Lakewood — Mother Mary John
The New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, — Mabel S. Douglas, *Dean*
Princeton University,* Princeton — Christian Gauss, *Dean*
Rutgers University,* New Brunswick — John M. Thomas
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station — Marie José, *Dean*
Upsala College, East Orange — Carl G. Erickson, *Dean*

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico,* Albuquerque — J. F. Zimmerman

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Brooklyn — Frank D. Blodgett
Alfred University, Alfred — Boothe C. Davis
University of Buffalo,* Buffalo — S. P. Capen
Canisius College, Buffalo — Peter Cusick
Colgate University, Hamilton — George B. Cutten
Columbia University,* New York — Herbert E. Hawkes, *Dean*
Cornell University,* Ithaca — Robert M. Ogden, *Dean*
D'Youville College, Buffalo — Mother Mary of Good Counsel
Elmira College, Elmira — Frederick Lent
Fordham University, New York — William J. Duane
Hamilton College, Clinton — Frederick C. Ferry
Hobart College, Geneva — Murray Bartlett
Keuka College, Keuka Park — A. H. Norton
Manhattan College, New York — Brother Cornelius
College of the City of New York, New York — F. B. Robinson
College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York — Sister Josephine Rosaire
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle — Mother M. Ignatius
New York University,* New York — Marshall S. Brown, *Dean*
University of Rochester,* Rochester — Rush Rhees
Russell Sage College, Troy — J. L. Meader
St. John's College, Brooklyn — Thomas F. Ryan, *Dean*
St. Lawrence University, Canton — Richard E. Sykes
St. Stephen's College, Annandale-on-Hudson — Bernard Iddings Bell
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs — Henry T. Moore
Syracuse University,* Syracuse — Charles W. Flint
Union College, Schenectady — Frank P. Day
United States Military Academy, West Point — Lucius H. Holt, *Dean*

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie ..... H. N. MacCracken
Wagner College, Staten Island ..... C. F. Dapp
Wells College, Aurora ..... K. D. Macmillan

NORTH CAROLINA

Catawba College, Salisbury ..... Elmer R. Hoke
Davidson College, Davidson ..... W. J. Martin
Duke University, Durham ..... W. P. Few
Elon College, Elon College ..... W. A. Harper
Guilford College, Guilford College ..... Raymond Binford
Meredith College, Raleigh ..... C. E. Brewer
North Carolina College for Women, Greensboro ..... J. I. Foust
University of North Carolina,* Chapel Hill ..... Addison Hibbard, *Dean*
Salem College, Winston-Salem ..... H. E. Rondthaler
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest ..... Francis P. Gaines

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown ..... B. H. Kroeze

OHIO

University of Akron,* Akron ..... George F. Zook
Antioch College, Yellow Springs ..... Arthur E. Morgan
Ashland College, Ashland ..... Edwin E. Jacobs
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea ..... A. B. Storms
Bluffton College, Bluffton ..... S. K. Mosiman
Capital University, Columbus ..... Otto Mees
University of Cincinnati,* Cincinnati ..... F. W. Chandler, *Dean*
University of Dayton, Dayton ..... Bernard P. O'Reilly
Defiance College, Defiance ..... Albert G. Caris
Denison University, Granville ..... A. A. Shaw
Heidelberg College, Tiffin ..... Charles E. Miller
Hiram College, Hiram ..... M. L. Bates
John Carroll University, Cleveland ..... B. J. Rodman
Kenyon College, Gambier ..... Wm. Foster Peirce
Lake Erie College, Painesville ..... Vivian B. Small
Marietta College, Marietta ..... Edward S. Parsons
Miami University,* Oxford ..... Alfred H. Upham
Mount Union College, Alliance ..... W. H. McMaster
Muskingum College, New Concord ..... J. Knox Montgomery
Oberlin College, Oberlin ..... Ernest H. Wilkins
Ohio Northern University, Ada ..... A. E. Smith
Ohio University,* Athens ..... E. B. Bryan
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware ..... E. D. Soper
Otterbein College, Westerville ..... W. G. Clippinger
Rio Grande College, Rio Grande ..... H. T. Houf

St. John's College, Toledo—William H. Fitzgerald
St. Xavier College, Cincinnati—Daniel M. O'Connell, *Dean*
Toledo University,* Toledo—Henry J. Doermann
The Western College for Women, Oxford—W. W. Boyd
Western Reserve University,* Cleveland—R. E. Vinson
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce—Gilbert H. Jones
Wilmington College, Wilmington—B. O. Skinner
Wittenberg College, Springfield—Rees E. Tulloss
College of Wooster, Wooster—C. F. Wishart

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, H. G. Bennett
Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee—W. W. Phelan
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City—Eugene M. Antrim
Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha—Howard Taylor, *Dean*
Phillips University, East Enid—I. N. McCash
University of Tulsa, Tulsa—John D. Finlayson

OREGON

Linfield College, McMinnville—L. W. Riley
Pacific University, Forest Grove—John F. Dobbs
Reed College, Portland—N. F. Coleman

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Myerstown—W. F. Teel
Allegheny College, Meadville—James A. Beebe
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr—Marion Edwards Park
Bucknell University, Lewisburg—E. W. Hunt
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh—Thomas S. Baker
Dickinson College, Carlisle—Mervin G. Filler
Drexel Institute, Philadelphia—Kenneth G. Matheson
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster—Henry Harbaugh Apple
Geneva College, Beaver Falls—McLeod M. Pearce
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg—Henry W. A. Hanson
Grove City College, Grove City—Weir C. Ketler
Haverford College, Haverford—W. W. Comfort
Juniata College, Huntingdon—M. G. Brumbaugh
Lafayette College, Easton—Wm. M. Lewis
Lebanon Valley College, Annville—G. D. Gossard
Lehigh University, Bethlehem—Charles Russ Richards
Lincoln University, Lincoln University—Wm. H. Johnson
Marywood College, Scranton—Mother M. Casimir
Muhlenberg College, Allentown—John A. W. Haas
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh—Cora H. Coolidge

University of Pennsylvania,* Philadelphia — Josiah H. Penniman
University of Pittsburgh,* Pittsburgh — John G. Bowman
St. Francis College, Loretto — Raphael Breheny
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia — A. G. Brown
St. Thomas College, Scranton — G. Lewis
Seton Hill College, Greensburg — Daniel R. Sullivan
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore — Frank Aydelotte
Temple University,* Philadelphia — Charles E. Beury
Thiel College, Greenville — E. Clyde Xander
Ursinus College, Collegeville — George L. Omwake
Villanova College, Villanova — James H. Griffin
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington — S. S. Baker
Westminster College, New Wilmington — W. Charles Wallace
Wilson College, Chambersburg — Ethelbert D. Warfield

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University,* Providence — Clarence A. Barbour
Providence College, Providence — D. M. Galliher, *Dean*

SOUTH CAROLINA

Chicora College for Women, Columbia — S. C. Byrd
Coker College, Hartsville — Carlyle Campbell
Converse College, Spartanburg — R. P. Pell
Furman University, Greenville — W. J. McGlothlin
Presbyterian College of South Carolina, Clinton — B. L. Parkinson
University of South Carolina, Columbia — D. M. Douglas
Winthrop College, Rock Hill — James P. Kinard
Wofford College, Spartanburg — Henry N. Snyder

SOUTH DAKOTA

Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell — Earl A. Roadman
Huron College, Huron — R. C. Agne
Yankton College, Yankton — George W. Nash

TENNESSEE

Carson and Newman College, Jefferson City — James T. Warren
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga — Arlo Ayres Brown
Cumberland University, Lebanon — E. L. Stockton
Fisk University, Nashville — Thomas E. Jones
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate — H. W. Roop
Maryville College, Maryville — Samuel Tyndale Wilson
Milligan College, Milligan — H. J. Derthick
University of the South, Sewanee — B. F. Finney
Southwestern, Memphis — C. E. Diehl
Tusculum College, Greeneville — Charles O. Gray
Vanderbilt University,* Nashville — J. H. Kirkland

TEXAS

Baylor College for Women, Belton — John C. Hardy
Baylor University, Waco — Samuel P. Brooks
College of Industrial Arts, Denton — L. H. Hubbard
Howard Payne College, Brownwood — Edward Godbold
Incarnate Word College, San Antonio — Mother M. Columkille
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio — H. A. Constantineau
Rice Institute, Houston — E. O. Lovett
Simmons College, Abilene — Jefferson D. Sandefer
Southern Methodist University, Dallas — Charles C. Selecman
Southwestern University, Georgetown — King Vivion
Texas Christian University, Ft. Worth — E. M. Waits
Trinity University, Waxahachie — J. H. Burma

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo — F. S. Harris
University of Utah,* Salt Lake City — George Thomas

VERMONT

Middlebury College, Middlebury — P. D. Moody
Norwich University, Northfield — Charles H. Plumley

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater — Paul H. Bowman
Emory and Henry College, Emory — J. N. Hillman
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg — J. T. T. Hundley
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland — R. E. Blackwell
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, — Dice Robins Anderson
Roanoke College, Salem — C. J. Smith
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar — Meta Glass
University of Richmond, Richmond — F. W. Boatwright
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg — Julian A. Burruss
Washington and Lee University, Lexington — H. L. Smith
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg — J. A. C. Chandler

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound, Tacoma — Edward H. Todd

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany — Cloyd Goodnight
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins — James E. Allen
Marshall College, Huntington — M. P. Sharkey
Salem College, Salem — S. O. Bond

West Virginia Collegiate Institute, Institute ..... John W. Davis
West Virginia University,* Morgantown ..... John R. Turner
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon ..... Homer E. Wark

WISCONSIN

Beloit College, Beloit ..... Irving Maurer
Carroll College, Waukesha ..... Wm. Arthur Ganfield
Lawrence College, Appleton ..... Henry M. Wriston
Marquette University, Milwaukee ..... Wm. M. Magee
Milton College, Milton ..... Alfred E. Whitford
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee ..... Lucia R. Briggs
Northland College, Ashland ..... J. D. Brownell
Ripon College, Ripon ..... Silas Evans
St. Mary's College, Prairie du Chien ..... Mother M. Angela

FOREIGN

Ginling College, Nanking, China ..... Yi fang Wu

HONORARY MEMBERS

By vote of the Association the following persons have been admitted to honorary membership:

Miss Belle Rankin	American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Charles R. Mann Dr. David A. Robertson	The American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Henry S. Pritchett Dr. Clyde Furst	The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York City
Dr. Frederick P. Keppel	The Carnegie Corporation, New York City
Mr. Trevor Arnett	The General Education Board, New York City
Dr. Stephen P. Duggan	Institute of International Education, New York City.
Dr. George E. Vincent	The Rockefeller Foundation, New York City
Dr. William J. Cooper Dr. Arthur T. Klein	The United States Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.

The officers of the Council of Church Boards of Education and the General Secretaries of its constituent Boards.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE*

NEW YORK, N. Y., MARCH 8, 1929

The Executive Committee of the Association of American Colleges met in the office of the Executive Secretary at 10:00 o'clock, March 8, 1929, all members of the Committee being present, that is, Presidents Snavely, Lewis, Bell and Tulloss, Mr. Arnett and R. L. Kelly.

The resignation of President Comstock from the Executive Committee, offered because this year the Fiftieth Anniversary of Radcliffe College is being celebrated, was accepted with deep regret and the Secretary was instructed so to advise her and to express the hope that in the near future we may have the benefit of her counsel as a member of the Executive Committee of the Association.

The resignation of President Little from the Chairmanship of the Commission on Organization of the College Curriculum was accepted with regret, and the Secretary was advised so to inform him.

President R. E. Tulloss, of Wittenberg College, who by invitation of the Executive Secretary was present at the meeting, was by unanimous vote elected a member of the Executive Committee to take the place of President Comstock.

Dean Eisenhart, of Princeton University, was elected Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the College Curriculum to take the place of President Little and the Executive Secretary was authorized to fill the vacancy on this Commission after consultation with Dean Eisenhart.

The resignation of Dean Randall from the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, offered by him in view of fifteen months' proposed absence from

* Abridged.

the country, was accepted with sincere regret. The Executive Committee expressed deep appreciation of his services in the past as the Chairman and as a member of this Commission.

The items in the report of the Committee on Resolutions were taken up seriatim.

President Snavely advised that it would be his policy in case a request came to him from any responsible source regarding a "fraudulent" college to follow the first suggestion of the Committee and bring the case to the attention of the appropriate regional educational organization.

The Executive Committee approved the Executive Secretary's nomination of Mr. Archie M. Palmer, Assistant Director of the Institute of International Education, for the position of Associate Secretary, approving that title rather than the title "Director of Educational Research" which had been suggested.*

The Executive Committee approved the recommendation of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure that that Commission be now discharged. It desired to go on record, however, in an expression of high appreciation of the service which has been rendered by this Commission during the past years. It also approved the suggestion of the Commission that the practice which has been in vogue for some years of an interchange of official delegates to the annual meetings between the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges be continued.

The Executive Committee approved the appointment of President Cowling as Chairman of the proposed joint committee of the Association and the Council of Church Boards of Education to deal with a uniform blank for college statistics and approved the Executive Secretary's nomination of President Rall, Dr. Reeves and Dr. Evenden as other members of that Committee. They also added to the Com-

*_Later_: Mr. Palmer has now been employed to begin his services on full time on August 1, 1929. _E. L. K._

BUDGET OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1929

For information and comparison, actual statement of business for 1928 is reported.

RECEIPTS

	1928	*Business of 1928*		*1929*	*Budget of 1929*	
Balance on hand January 1		$ 5,846.94			$ 6,527.55	
Membership Dues	@ $25.00	9,950.00		@ $50.00	20,200.00	
BULLETIN and Offprint (sales)		2,527.69		BULLETIN	2,000.00	
The Effective College (sales)		3,789.04			500.00	
Interest on Deposits		373.42			500.00	
Miscellaneous		31.14	$22,518.23			$29,727.55

DISBURSEMENTS

Book on College Architecture	1,000.00			1,000.00	
Annual Meeting	545.20			750.00	
Intellectual Life Project				500.00	
Dues American Council on Education	100.00			100.00	
Expenses of the Executive Committee	159.63			300.00	
BULLETIN and Offprint	3,574.51		BULLETIN	3,000.00	
Christian Education subs. @ $ .75	299.25		@ $1.00	406.00	

Expenses of Headquarters' Office:							
Salaries:							
Executive Secretary				(50%)	4,000.00*		
Sec'y to Executive Secretary	1,200.00			(54%)	1,200.00*		
Stenographer	1,300.00			(100%)	1,300.00		
Associate Secretary			(@ $5,400—5 months)		$2,250.00		
Research Assistant	$ 500.00*			(6 months)	1,000.00		
Stenographer				(6 months)	8.00.00		
Mailing Clerk	500.00		and Bookkeeper	(50%)	650.00*		
Office girl	500.00			(50%)	600.00*		
Rent	1,000.00		(add'l 9 months)		1,375.00		
Office Expense, including equipment	850.00	5,850.00	(additional room)		1,500.00	14,675.00	
Expenses of Permanent Commissions		713.95				1,000.00	
Treasurer's Office		146.58				250.00	
Dr. Kelly's Insurance		480.00				480.00	
Special Vacation for Dr. Kelly						500.00	
The Effective College: (production and distribution)		3,021.41			Distribution, adv., etc.	250.00	
Emergency		100.15				150.00	
		$15,990.68				$23,361.00	
Anticipated balance January 1, 1930						6,366.55	$29,727.55

* The balance of salary paid by the Council of Church Boards of Education.

mittee Mr. Christiansen, of the University of Michigan, Mr. Wintringer, of Princeton University, and President Zook, of the University of Akron, and instructed the Executive Secretary to notify all persons concerned of their appointment.

The various other items of the Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Association at Chattanooga were reviewed and the Minutes as a whole were approved.

The matter of the proposed appraisal of the intellectual life of selected colleges which was referred by the Association to the Executive Committee was approved in principle after a historic statement of the development of the idea had been made by the Executive Secretary and the idea in its present stage of development set forth by Mr. Arnett. It was voted that on the evening of May 6 a conference to consider the value of this project and to formulate an adequate statement of it if it were approved, be held at the University Club, New York City, the purpose being to arrive at such statement of the project as might be presented to one or more foundations with the view of securing their financial assistance.

The Executive Secretary submitted a tentative budget for 1929, which with minor modifications and suggestions was approved and is submitted herewith. It was voted by the Executive Committee that the salary of the Executive Secretary provided for in the budget begin as of January 1, 1929.

The plans for the March and May issues of the BULLETIN were approved.

It was voted that the next annual meeting of the Association be held on January 16–18, and that an effort be made to secure President Hoover as a speaker at the annual banquet on the contribution which the colleges may make in the field of foreign relations or specifically to the development of World Peace; that pending the reply from President Hoover the question of the place of holding the annual meeting be held in abeyance.

It was the judgment of the Executive Committee that the annual program should include also reports of the various standing commissions of the Association, with especial emphasis perhaps on the work during the year of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers. The Executive Committee expressed the hope that this Commission would give especial attention during the year to the training of college teachers in service.

The Executive Committee expressed great interest in the project of the American Association of University Professors with regard to its proposed Teachers Placement Bureau and awaits with interest a definite announcement concerning its plans.

The Executive Committee approved the applications of the following institutions for membership in the Association, to be recommended at the next Annual Meeting.

College	*President*
College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.	Harrison Randolph
Erskine College, Due West, S. C.	R. C. Grier
Immaculata College, (formerly Villa Maria) Immaculata, Pa.	Sister Maria Alma
Limestone College, Gaffney, S. C.	R. C. Granberry
St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md.	Sister Paula

No action was taken on the applications of the following institutions:

College	*President*
Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa.	Wm. A. Pearson, Dean
Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga.	John Hope
Rider College, Trenton, N. J.	Franklin B. Moore
Spelman College, Atlanta, Ga.	Florence M. Read
State Teachers College, East Radford, Va.	John P. McConnell

The Executive Committee took lunch at the Aldine Club and remained there until adjournment at 3:00 o'clock P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Secretary*

APPENDIX

STATISTICAL DATA CONCERNING GREAT TEACHERS*

Academic Training of 362 Great Teachers**

Highest Degree	*No. of Teachers*
Ph.D., Sc.D., Pd.D., M.D., etc.	142
M.A., M.S.	142
B.D.	9
B.A., B.S., etc.	62
No degree	7
Total	362
Total with degrees	355

Sources of 142 Doctor's Degrees[1]

Institutions	*No.*	*Institutions Named but Once*
Chicago	11	Basle
Columbia	10	Brown
Cornell	8	Bryn Mawr
Harvard	8	University of Colorado
Johns Hopkins	8	University of Denver
Yale	5	Göttingen
Iowa State University	4	Hanover
Univ. of Pennsylvania	4	Illinois
Wisconsin	4	Kalamazoo
New York University	3	Minnesota
Wooster	3	Nebraska
Boston University	2	University of North Carolina
California	2	Oskaloosa
Clark	2	Vanderbilt
Cumberland	2	University of Virginia
Indiana	2	Washington and Jefferson
University of Michigan	2	Washington and Lee
Princeton	2	Waynesburg
Leipzig	2	Western Reserve
Strassburg	2	Westminster College (Mo.)

Institutions Conferring Five or More Master's Degrees

Columbia	11	Michigan	5
Chicago	10	Princeton	5
Harvard	5	Vanderbilt	5

* See page 49.

** Data compiled from replies to the question: "What were their *earned* degrees? From what institutions?"

[1] Sources of 36 degrees not reported.

Qualities Exemplified by Great Teachers*

Interest in students, love of students, sympathy, helpfulness, etc.	50
Knowledge or mastery of subject, scholarship	37
Personality	22
Character	17
Enthusiasm	11
Sincerity	11
Ability to inspire students	10
Thoroughness	10
High requirements from students	9
Ability to stimulate thought	7
Breadth	7
Industry	7
Patience	7
Accuracy	6
Fairness	6
Ability to impart, "to put it across," etc.	5
Interest in or love of subject	5
Humanness, human interest, etc.	5
Cooperation	4
High idealism	4
Honesty	4
Honesty in attitude toward truth	4
Integrity	4
Loyalty	4
Personal contacts	4
Clearness of teaching	3
Devotion	3
Friendliness	3
Good common sense	3
Keen insight	3
Mental alertness	3
Religious influence	3
Ability to make interesting	2
Ability to interpret life's meanings and values	2
Clear thinking	2
Clearness	2
Culture	2
Frankness	2
Interest	2
Interest in work	2
Precept and example	2
Readiness to sacrifice time and energy to further work of college	2

* See page 55.

Refinement of speech	2
Religious devotion	2
Research	2
Respect	2
Service	2

The following were named once each:

Able to arouse initiative
Adaptability to student needs
Adaptation
Affableness
Assurance
Charity
Christian convictions
Christian gentlemen, who worked at it
Christian idealism
Conscientiousness in assigned duties
Conservatism
Constructive attitude
Cooperative relations in conducting subject matter
Earnestness
Effective speaker
Fidelity to duty as he saw it
Gentlemen
Great desire for working with youth
High standards of honor
Highly cultivated mind
Humbleness
Humor
Incisiveness
Independent
Intellectual industry
Intelligence
Interest in general problems of education
Interest in good teaching
Interesting and thorough teacher
Leadership in ideational matters
Lecturer (public)
Loving disposition
Lucidity of expression
Manliness
Moral power
Much time in student conference
Originality in spirit and method
Permanent student mind
Perseverance
Persistence
Philosophy of life
Power of apt and concise illustration
Practical application
Preparedness
Professional equipment
Religious convictions
Resourcefulness
Reverence for truth
Self-assertive
Simplicity
Sincerity combined with good fellowship
Skill in going to heart of subject
Spirit
Spiritual-mindedness
Spiritual power
Stimulating moral idealism
Strictness combined with sympathy
Success in classroom management
Tact
True enjoyment of the enlarging vision in the particular field
Unselfishness
Utter trustworthiness
Wholesome attitude
"One highly regarded by public on account of success of his students in competition."

Methods Used by Great Teachers. *See Page 55*

Clear presentation 3

The following were mentioned once each:

Class discussion, questions and answers, lectures to limited extent
Clear presentation, logical conclusions, illustrations from everyday life.
Combination of inspirational lectures, open discussion, rigorous quizzes, oral and written
Daily recitation and drill
Dialectic
Discussion, conferences
Discussion, largely
Free discussion, explanation and lectures
Human
Not entirely lectures, more socialized recitation. Clear, concise assignments not to limit amount of student preparation
Practical application
Questions, largely
Research
"Great teachers are superior to method."

Subjects Taught by Great Teachers with the Frequency Named by 158 Institutions

English and English Literature	68	Modern Languages	6
Mathematics	57	Geology	5
Philosophy	44	Political Science	5
Greek	42	French	4
Latin	40	Language	4
History	36	Botany	3
Biology	30	Religion	3
Chemistry	29	Zoology	3
Bible	24	Art	2
Science	20	Classic Art	2
Education	17	Astronomy	2
Social Science	13	Ethics	2
German	12	Government	2
Psychology	12	Hebrew	2
Physics	9	Logic	2
Economics	8	New Testament	2
Sociology	8	Theology	2

The following subjects were mentioned once each:

Business Administration
Christian Evidences
Dramatic Art
Law
Music
Nature Study
Practical Theology
Religious Education
Sacred Language and Literature
Spanish
Theism

Terms of Service of Great Teachers*

Note: In the following tabulation service began in the period indicated in the first column and terminated in the same period or in that indicated in the second column.

From	To	No.
1841–50		1
1841–50	1851–60	1
1851–60	1891–1900	1
1851–60	1901–1910	2
1861–70	1871–80	3
1861–70	1881–90	4
1861–70	1891–1900	2
1861–70	1901–1910	1
1861–70	1911–1920	2
1861–70	present	1
1871–80		1
1871–80	1881–90	1
1871–80	1891–1900	6
1871–80	1901–1910	1
1871–80	1911–1920	6
1871–80	1921–27	3
1871–80	present	4
1881–90		1
1881–90	1891–1900	3
1881–90	1901–1910	6
1881–90	1911–1920	5
1881–90	1921–27	6
1881–90	present	15
1891–1900		1
1891–1900	1901–1910	10
1891–1900	1911–1920	8
1891–1900	1921–27	5
1891–1900	present	20
1901–1910		3
1901–1910	1911–1920	4
1901–1910	1921–27	3
1901–1910	present	29
1911–1920		4
1911–1920	1921–27	4
1911–1920	present	45
1921–27		3
1921–27	present	18
		233

*In the 233 distributions recorded it is not known how many teachers were included. In several instances it was obvious that a number of teachers in a given decade were under consideration.

The Enlistment of Best Students for College Teaching in 187 Institutions*

Encouraging them to go on for graduate work (12 of these also aid students in securing fellowships, scholarships, etc.)	73
Through personal conferences, interviews, or individual efforts on the part of the president, dean, major adviser, heads of departments, or other faculty members	28
Courses in Education, Departments of Education, etc.	22
Assistantships, instructorships, etc.	15
Vocational advice through chapel addresses, vocational conferences, guidance, etc.	8
Giving encouragement (method not specified)	7
Calling attention to the opportunities and rewards of teaching	6
Placement service	4
Setting a good example	3
Emphasizing need of college teachers, Christian teachers, virile teachers, etc.	3
Holding up teaching ideal	2
Miscellaneous (see below)	28
Nothing, no definite effort, no special plans, etc.	16
No answer	8

Miscellaneous Replies

A scholarship service, semi-annually. Scholarship societies and medals.

Offer three graduate fellowships to our best men and urge them to study for doctor's degrees.

Director of Personnel emphasizes annual conference of honors students with Dean of a graduate school.

Let them see the best side of the teaching profession.

Requiring a high type of scholarship.

By interesting them in research and by attracting the best students to special work in honors courses.

Offer them the best possible positions as soon as they are prepared.

Building a fund from which they may borrow money for the prosecution of post-graduate work.

Have found it more satisfactory to train our own graduates who are familiar with the aim and spirit of the institution than to engage graduates of other colleges and train them.

To give them character building education without pressing any particular calling or profession before them.

* As several institutions named more than one method the total of the above tabulations is larger than the number of institutions replying.

Trying to make financial remuneration sufficiently attractive to make possible teaching here.

Inspiring in them a love of their major subject so that they will want to go on for post-graduate work.

Select most promising. Employ when opportunity arises.

More ——— graduates in Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences than any other small college.

Unusual number of students have scholarships or teaching fellowships in graduate schools. Considerable opportunity for cooperative relations with college professors, which stimulate the taste and ideal for teaching.

Giving the best training and inspiration through the various departments.

Faculty urged to search out such students.

List such men as seem to have ability, adaptability, and real leadership.

Recommendation for college positions usually conditional upon graduate work accomplished.

Planning a program for study of teaching as a profession.

Stimulating their interest through an educational fraternity.

Personal contacts maintained with students doing graduate work in other institutions.

Graduate council of the university has provided a plan in each department for enlisting promising students for college teaching.

Keep in touch with them with a view to helping them to find positions after graduate study.

Incidentally. The atmospheric condition in this institution is surcharged with the educational spirit and we send out many teachers.

Pay minimum salary for instructor, $2000.

Informal efforts only.

Rely mainly upon the zeal of teachers to reproduce their kind. Some work of importance is done by a committee on vocational guidance.